

THE
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1866.

- ART. I.—1. *History of the Secession Church.* By JOHN MCKERROW, D.D. 1841.
2. *History of the Relief Church.* By GAVIN STRUTHERS, D.D. 1843.
3. *The Ten Years' Conflict.* By ROBERT BUCHANAN, D.D. Two Volumes. Blackie and Son. 1849.
4. *Ten Years of the Church of Scotland.* By JAMES BRYCE, D.D. Two Volumes. Blackwood and Sons. 1850.
5. *The late Secession from the Church of Scotland.* By the Rev. JAMES MACFARLANE, D.D., Duddingstone. Blackwood and Sons. 1846.
6. *Germany, England, and Scotland.* By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, D.D. London: Simpkin and Marshall. 1848.
7. *Life of Dr. Chalmers.* By WILLIAM HANNA, D.D., LL.D.
8. *The Lives of Robert and James Haldane.* By ALEXANDER HALDANE, Esq. Edinburgh: W. P. Kennedy. 1855.
9. *Memoir of John Brown, D.D.* By JOHN CAIRNS, D.D. Edmonston and Douglas. 1860.
10. *Life of Professor Robertson.* By Rev. A. CHARTERIS, M.A. Blackwood and Sons. 1863.
11. *Sermons of the Rev. Andrew Gray, of Perth, with Memoir by Dr. Candlish.* Edinburgh: John MacLaren. 1864.
12. *Reform in the Church of Scotland: Part I. Worship.* By ROBERT LEE, D.D. Edmonston and Douglas. 1864.
13. *The Church of Scotland Home and Foreign Missionary Record.* July 1st, 1865. Blackwood and Son.
14. *The Free Church of Scotland Monthly Record.* July 1st, 1865. Nelson and Sons.

15. *Missionary Record of the United Presbyterian Church.* April 1st, 1865. Oliphant and Co.
16. *The Reformed Presbyterian Magazine.* June and July, 1865. Johnstone, Hunter, and Co.

THE Presbyterian churches in Scotland have, all of them, the unspeakable advantage of inheriting great traditions, sacred associations, a venerable history. The attempts which were made, two hundred years ago, to force episcopacy on the Scottish Reformed Church failed most signally; they had the effect of bestowing on oppressed Presbyterianism the consecration of glorious martyrdoms, old memories of faithfulness unto death which cling about hill-sides and misty moorlands, where the infamous Claverhouse and his dragoons butchered the pious peasantry like sheep—about golden sands where matron and maiden, tied to stakes within the watermark, bore their testimony, till the waves closed over them—about battle-fields, where the persecuted, goaded past all endurance, took the sword, alas, only to perish with the sword—about the Grass Market of Edinburgh, where, in the shadow of the Castle Rock, one nonconforming preacher after another died triumphing in death. In these old traditions all the Presbyterian churches in Scotland have a part, more or less deservedly; and the enemies of Presbyterianism, under the last of the Stuart kings, have surrounded it for ever with a "cloud of witnesses," and imparted to it a peculiar strength and consolidation. An evil and defect, however, has resulted from all this, which we must notice in order to be calmly historical. Scottish Presbyterianism has exhibited a certain extremeness, a certain one-sided vehemence, due to the oppressions of its earlier history, and the natural reactions which were caused by persecuting violence. It has kept itself apart from the rest of the world; cherished suspicion and mistrust; confounded essentials and accidentals; thought lightly of all other churches of Christ; and, proud of a dogmatical orthodoxy, has undervalued living faith and Christian work. The fiery trials, particularly of the last thirty years, have at length taught it meekness; its disintegrated sections have been thrown on the sympathy of other Christian churches; it has felt the rising waves of modern religious thought and action, and has been drawn to give a wider meaning to the prayer, "Thy kingdom come."

The Presbyterian church-government is unquestionably analogous in many respects to republicanism in civil government; though it cannot be made out historically to have ever

favoured rebellion, unless when the ruler attempted to crush beneath his foot civil and religious liberty. It has a central administration supreme over all, and at the same time, as it were, separate state administrations, in their own province more or less independent. Of its courts, the typical one is the presbytery, consisting of all the ministers of a particular district and a lay elder* from each congregation. The presbyteries of a province meet in synod to form a court higher than the presbyteries themselves; and when the church is large enough, and includes within it several provincial synods, the presbyteries send representatives according to a fixed proportion, ministers and laymen in equal numbers, to form the General Assembly, which reviews the proceedings of the inferior judicatories, and is the court of last resort. Two things are especially noticeable about these ecclesiastical bodies: one is their popular constitution, the clergy and laity mingling in them in equal numbers, the parity of presbyters being strictly maintained; the other is their judicial character, for they claim to be not mere conferences of brethren, but courts constituted by—and administering without appeal to any power on earth—a higher than human law. The results which flow from such an organization, its advantages and the dangers which beset it, are sufficiently manifest. Presbyterianism, if living and active, must acquire a firm grasp on the masses of the people, and has power to maintain, wherever it holds sway, a peculiarly rigorous discipline. But, at the same time, it hands over the decision of all important questions to majorities, and, when these can be formed and swayed by a clever partisan leader, there is no escape from the tyranny of which they may be and have been guilty. Their commandments are issued in the name of Christ, and in virtue of a spiritual authority which suffers no test to be applied to it but that of the Word of God and the individual conscience. Of course these commandments relate only to doctrine, and worship, and discipline; they are kept carefully within the spiritual, and out of the civil, region. A Presbyterian claims for the visible church all the dignity and authority imputed in Holy Scripture to the body of Christ; claims for his own denomination, whatever it be, that it is, to all intents and purposes, the visible church; and asserts that in its courts all this dignity and authority reside. The office-bearers who form these courts are to a large extent popularly elected, but derive

* An elder is an ordained office-bearer, ordained not to teach, but to rule, and a layman, only in so far as he is not a minister.

their office not from the people, but directly from Christ, the King of Zion and Head of the Church. It will be seen at once, that an ecclesiastical body so constituted was well adapted to endure the storms of persecution with an unshaken front; and would be well fitted, were it less hampered than it is at present by traditions and conventionalisms, were it more plastic, more disposed to adapt itself to special circumstances and special needs, to throw itself with a singular concentration of energy into the work of the evangelization of the world. In Scotland, for reasons already indicated, and which will more fully appear as we proceed, it has been too prone, in discharging its function of witnessing for Christ, to neglect more or less its function, no less great, of working for Him.

The year of the Disruption, 1843, is the great way-mark in the ecclesiastical history of Scotland, since the Revolution of 1688. The preceding century slowly ripened to this, in one view sorrowful, in another most glorious and blessed, result. And the period which is now running its course is a most natural development of the Disruption, though surprising and unacceptable, in various ways, to many of the actors in it. The Church of Scotland has been honoured to contend, mainly, for the spiritual independence of the Church—the entire freedom from any Erastian interference of the State in its affairs; or, as its own theologians love to put it, somewhat broadly, the Headship of Christ over the visible Church. The settlement of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland, made by Dutch William at the close of the seventeenth century, endued the Presbyterian Church with a civil establishment, but left its internal government uncontrolled and free. The wisdom and grace of this act, however, were marred by the restoration of lay patronage in the reign of Queen Anne, 1711, in the teeth of the strongest remonstrances from Scotland. The immediate consequences of the people's loss of the right to elect their own ministers, were the filling of the pulpits with a careless, and the frequent intrusion of an unacceptable, clergy. There were found within the church those who favoured oppressive measures, as well as those who, in the cause of religious life and freedom, protested against them. The former were able to command a majority in the church-courts, and the result of their violent proceeding was, the secession of the Erskines in 1738, who became the founders of the Secession Church, and the withdrawal of Mr. Gillespie, of Carnock, in 1752, who became the founder of the Synod of Relief; besides innumerable other

minor separations, the results of particular acts of tyranny. When these good men had been driven out of the Scottish National Church, and the religious life of the country had begun to gather about them or their disciples, and to swell the stream of dissent to a mighty river, the period of Robertson the historian, and Home, the author of the tragedy of "Douglas," and Dr. Carlyle of Inveresk—the latter half of the eighteenth century—began in the Presbyterian Church, a time of intellectual brilliancy, of culture, and refinement, but of utter spiritual death. God did not, however, forsake altogether the church which, in former days, had borne faithful witness to His truth; did not leave the "moderate" clergy—claret-drinking, play-going, fond of gay society, semi-infidel in doctrine, and lax in practice—to shape the spiritual life of Scotland as they would. The tides of life which Wesley and Whitfield evoked in England, swept, though in lesser waves, across the Scottish border. Other revivals of religion took place at intervals, like gleams of sunshine in a sullen sky. Early in the present century, the brothers Haldane were honoured to do a glorious work. The rise of Independency in Scotland, as of Methodism, was attended by a deep and general religious influence, in which the Presbyterian churches shared. At last the reign of the moderate party ceased; the impatience of forced settlements of ministers, and of the yoke of patronage, became more general; the erection of many new churches and congregations, through the evangelistic zeal of Dr. Chalmers, brought into the field many ministers popularly chosen, and of the most earnest spirit; and the General Assembly of the Kirk began by majorities to adopt such measures as the Veto Act of 1834, which gave the people a right to reject, without reason assigned, an unacceptable presentee, and which were steps in the direction of entire spiritual independence. The secular party in the church itself clung to the old order of things, and the rejected presentees appealed to the civil tribunals to command the church to instal them. Marnoch in Strathbogie and Auchterarder were the two special bones of contention at the last. The civil courts, from the Court of Session up to the House of Lords, commanded the church-courts to induct the unacceptable presentees; and after much discussion, made it plain that the ecclesiastical establishment was not to be enjoyed unless on condition of the church's submission to the decisions of the civil judges, even when these contradicted its own enactments, and went against its conscientious fidelity to Christ. Then, spurning a miserable compromise—Lord Aber-

deen's Bill, 1840,—the majority of the General Assembly of the Kirk laid a protest on the table, in St. Andrew's Church, Edinburgh, on 18th May, 1843, and withdrew amidst great popular excitement to a hall of their own, there to inaugurate the Free Church of Scotland. This was the last of the Secessions—called more appropriately the Disruption, because in this case the majority of the Assembly withdrew from the civil establishment, leaving the minority, in number, and still more in ability and worth, in possession.

The world has heard the fame of this act of self-sacrifice ;—for it was such, on the part of many, if not of all, who signed the protest, and withdrew from St. Andrew's Church to Tanfield Hall. It meant that livings had to be given up, manse to be quitted, church-bells to hang silent in their tower till they should be rung when another pastor should stand in the old pulpit and make the loved walls resound to his voice. The nonconforming clergy went home from the eloquent speeches, and songs of praise, and hurrying excitement of Edinburgh, to weeping wives and wondering children ; the fire in the manse-hearth must go out, and the key be turned in the door. It is scarcely to be wondered at that the hearts of some failed them at the last. Yet, in one day, 400 ministers gave up their all for their cause, to be followed afterwards by still more. The glories of 1662 were recalled in 1843. Much suffering, however, was soothed or prevented altogether by the attachment of the people, and new churches and manses began to rise beside the old as fast as might be. To bring this time of trial somewhat more into relief, we quote the words of two of these ministers. One was walking by moonlight with a friend, an Edinburgh minister, who tells the story, when they passed the forsaken and silent manse, standing in its quiet beauty beneath the moonbeams ; and the city brother said, " Oh, my friend, it was a noble thing to leave that house ! " " Ah ! yes," he replied, " it was a noble thing : but for all that it was a bitter thing. I shall never forget the night I left that house till I am laid in the grave. When I saw my wife and children go forth in the gloaming, when I saw them for the last time leave our own door, and when in the dark I was left alone, with none but my God in that house, and when I had to take water and quench the fire on my own hearth, and put out the candle in my own house, and turn the key against myself, and my wife, and my little ones that night—God in His mercy grant that such a night I may never see again—it was a noble thing to leave the manse, and I bless God for the grace which was given to

me: but for all that it was a cruel and bitter night to me." Another had to put his wife and children in a cart and follow them across the mountains. A heavy snow-storm was raging, though it was summer, on the height over which they had to pass. They went on through the driving snow and cutting wind. "We knew not," said the minister afterwards, "where to find a place to dwell in: but never did I know so much of the peace of God as I did that night. Thus are fulfilled the Saviour's precious promises: 'The Lord is my Shepherd: I shall not want.'" In many cases, the faithful congregations shared the hardships of their ministers. Those landlords who could see nothing but rebellion against law and order, nothing of high principle and self-sacrifice in these proceedings of the clergy and people, refused to grant sites for the erection of churches in which they might worship apart from the State. The times of the Covenant for awhile seemed to be restored. The melody of psalms and the voice of the preacher were heard in lonely forests, in sheltered dales, even on the dusty highway or the sands left bare by the receding tide, when the worshippers were hunted from every spot which the squire could claim as his own. However, these acts of oppression were speedily put an end to by the highest authority in the country; and the *site-refusers*, as they are called, are now remembered in Scotland along with Claverhouse and his troopers, and have left an unquestionable blot on the civilisation, to say nothing of the Christianity, of the nineteenth century. Exposure to the elements in the most ungenial of climates—insufficient means of subsistence—miserable accommodation to which those were doomed who had been comfortably if not delicately nurtured—carried off some of these faithful men, and shortened more or less the lives of almost all. The revelations which were made by Dr. Guthrie, when he advocated his most successful manse-building scheme, drew from the whole country a cry of indignation and horror.

That state of things has passed away. The din of old conflicts is dying out in the distance. The holy zeal and anger, as well as the pain, have grown more calm. But it was necessary that we should recall the main features of an event which shapes the ecclesiastical history of Scotland at this hour. Its history has still to be written by an impartial hand. The new generation has scarcely yet had opportunity to pronounce its judgment. In the two severed churches feelings are still keen; men attach an excessive importance to deeds and sufferings in which they bore a part; and free

criticism, from the historical point of view, is scarcely safe as yet. There have been many eager historians of the Disruption, and the events which led to it; but, with one exception, if he be an exception, the author of the "Life of Professor Robertson," not one is anything but a keen partisan. From Dr. Buchanan on the one side, and Dr. Bryce on the other,—both accurate enough we have no reason to doubt, but each writing from his own point of view, and avowedly vindicating his own cause,—the reader whose interest in the matter is a merely historical one must extract for himself a connected story. The soldier who recounts the battles in which he was himself engaged, will be unsurpassed for vividness of narrative, but must necessarily give prominence to what concerned him most nearly, betray his personal interest in the matter, utter more or less his own feelings, and so yield us, not history by any means, but only the materials of history. Amidst the heat of controversy, still more when that controversy involves in its issues all that men count most precious, it is difficult for opponents to believe in each other's sincerity and singleness of heart, to distinguish between intellectual error and moral guilt. And there is no doubt that the records of the Free Church party are blotted with charges of weakness or wickedness, made against those at whose graves, and in the calm retrospect of whose career, they would be at once recalled. The Life of Professor Robertson, to which we have already referred, with its grave and lucid history of a pious, unswervingly faithful, and simple-minded man, must have astonished not a little, and become the source of many thoughts to, those who could scarcely find language strong enough to characterise unfavourably the spirit and career of "Robertson of Ellon." When fidelity to our own convictions passes over into bitter animadversion on those who differ from us, we go on dangerous ground, and sow for ourselves a future crop of inward rebukes. Mr. Charteris will now find, on every hand, a response to the tender truth of the passage with which he closes his narrative of the great struggle, and in which he groups together the names of the champions who now sleep in dust: "The best and greatest men whom the controversy set in opposition are not now numbered with the members of any visible church, but it is our privilege, as Christians, to believe that they are joined in the general assembly and church of the first-born. Chalmers, and Cook, and Gordon, and Mearns, and Welsh, and Lee, and many more, are, we rejoice to think, united in that church, without spot or blemish, where king and priest

are one. And, although I anticipate, it deepens our solemnity to remember that, when a year had shed its showers and snows on the grave of James Robertson, bleak December, which had carried him away, bore from his brethren William Cunningham. They were set face to face in many a fight, and now they rest together. They cherished mutual respect throughout the hard encounters, and, ere their labours on earth were closed, when one had retired from public life to study the theology of past ages, and the other had sacrificed learned leisure to the great cause of the evangelisation of Scotland, they spoke of each other as was to be expected of true men drinking at a purer source than the muddy waters of controversy. But now, when they see eye to eye, and dwell in the light of God's eternal love, how unworthy must seem to those saints every feeling that erewhile marred the fulness of their Christian brotherhood!"

But now we must turn aside to trace the course of those earlier streams of dissent which we spoke of a little while ago, dissent due most distinctly to the same cause as the Disruption of 1843. Although, since 1711, congregations had formally and legally lost the right to choose their own ministers, yet there still remained in the earlier part of last century a great measure of freedom, in consequence of what was called the *jus devolutum*; that is, when the patron failed to present a minister to the vacant charge within six months, the right to do so lapsed to the Presbytery, which, when the liberal party was pretty strong in it, made that right over finally to the people. In 1732 a law was passed, in a somewhat high-handed and unconstitutional manner, by the General Assembly of that year, committing the patronage of all parishes not otherwise provided for to the elders and heritors in the country, and the magistrates, town council, and elders in towns: thus making popular election, if the law were carried out, an impossibility. In the same year, on the 10th of October, from the pulpit of Perth, and before the Synod of Perth and Stirling, Mr. Ebenezer Erskine, one of the ministers of Stirling, preached a sermon from Psalm cxviii. 22, in which he expressed himself, about the yoke of patronage and liberties of the people, in such a way as greatly to provoke those of his clerical hearers who belonged to the dominant party in the church. He was summoned to the bar of the Assembly in the following year, but maintained unflinchingly his ministerial freedom. A commission of the Assembly, held in November, 1733, separated him, and three other ministers who adhered to him, Messrs. Wilson, of

Perth, Moncrieff, of Abernethy, and Fisher, of Kinclaven, from their charges, and declared them no longer ministers of the national church. These four met at Gairney Bridge, near Kinross, on the fifth of the following month, a memorable day in the ecclesiastical annals of Scotland, and formed "the Associate Presbytery," which was to grow to the Secession Church; Mr. Ralph Erskine, of Dunfermline, and Mr. Mair, of Orwell, who afterwards joined them, being present on the occasion. At this time they did not dream of forming a separate denomination; they professed only to secede temporarily from the dominant party in the church. Negotiations were even carried on at intervals, during the following years, with a view to their return to the bosom of the national church. These, however, were unsatisfactory to the seceding brethren, and they proceeded to take up more and more definitely the position of a separate religious body. And in 1740, the seceding ministers, now eight in number, with the addition of Messrs. Nairn, of Abbotshall, and Thomson, of Burntisland, were formally deposed and expelled from the church; and their parish churches, in which they had continued all this while to preach, were closed against them. From this secession speedily arose a strong dissenting church, following the steps of Ralph and Ebenezer Erskine: a church a little narrow perhaps; by the very intensity of its recoil from the backsliding national church led to insist on and exaggerate minor peculiarities; but a church so unquestionably pure in doctrine and faithful in practice as to make the name "Seceder" in Scotland the same honourable distinction as in England are "Puritan" and "Methodist." The narrow punctiliousness to which we have referred brought it about, that, after fourteen years of rapid growth, this church split into two sections, vulgarly called Burghers and Anti-burghers. The cause of the disruption, and of the peculiar denominational names, was a dispute as to the lawfulness of taking a certain *burgess oath*, introduced by the government of the day, which contained a profession of attachment to the Church of Scotland. Some believed themselves in conscience free to make this profession, understanding it of attachment to the Church of Scotland in that ideal purity to which they looked forward, and at the realisation of which they would at once cross her forsaken threshold. Others could not take this oath, they thought, without sin; and so it was the means of rending the infant Secession Church asunder. This breach was healed in the year 1820; since which date this church, now called the United Secession, resting on a broader basis, looking less

backward, and more onward to the glorious future, has made signal progress. Fourteen years before, a secession from the two seceding bodies had taken place; illustrating the tendency of the Scotch to make conscience of the smallest matters theological and ecclesiastical, to set purity very far indeed above peace, and to trouble their heads little about the sin of schism. The great majority of the seceders at this period adopted the views long held by English Nonconformists, as to the relation between Church and State—the voluntary principle, as it is called in Scotland: but a minority, distinguished by talent and worth, led by Dr. McCrie, clung to the doctrine of the Divine authority of church establishments, maintaining also the duty of national covenanting, and formed at Whitburn, on the 26th August, 1806, the Constitutional Associate Presbytery, afterwards the Original Secession Church. These, with few exceptions, joined themselves to the Free Church after the Disruption. In 1847, the United Secession, founded, as we have seen, by the Erskines, amalgamated with the Synod of Relief, founded by Mr. Gillespie, of Carnock, who was deposed by the General Assembly of 1752, for refusing to aid in the unpopular and oppressive settlement of a minister at Inverkeithing. The latter ecclesiastical body, beginning with one solitary congregation, had increased by affording *relief* or a refuge to congregations of the national church oppressed in their religious privileges, till it numbered 114 congregations; while the former, now united and strong, having begun with five, had multiplied to 400 congregations. Marvellous illustration of the seed yielding thirty, sixty, an hundredfold; of the miracle in which the barley-loaves and little fishes became food for thousands! The great river into which these streams, rising in the hills farther back, or not so far, have rolled their converging waters, is now the United Presbyterian Church.

There is still another religious body, which has its own point of view, and is a factor, not unimportant, in the Presbyterian ecclesiastical life of Scotland. One of the most heroic names in the history of the persecutions under the Stuart kings, is the name of Richard Cameron. He was a young Scotch minister, to whom the deliverance of the suffering Presbyterian Church became the one idea of his fiery youth. He grew up, in the midst of the worst and darkest time, frequented in his earliest years the conventicles in the fields, and had to betake himself to Holland, the favourite asylum of Scottish sufferers for conscience' sake,

that he might study for the ministry and receive ordination. This done, he returned to run a brief and sad career in his native country. It was emphatically "the killing time." Every sermon that Cameron preached, he preached as a man under sentence of death. And with his resolute spirit there was sympathy enough in the vast crowds that listened to him, in secluded hollows, while watchers were posted on the surrounding heights to give warning of the approach of the military. It is not to be wondered at that the position he took up was a very extreme one, and has given a colour to the assertions of Jacobitical writers that there was as much of politics as religion in the principles of the Covenanters. He allied himself to the societies which were then formed for mutual help among the oppressed, against the violence of the oppressor. He is supposed to have had to do with the mysterious publication, by a band of disguised horsemen, at the Cross of Sanquhar, of a declaration in which the government and authority of King James II. were formally renounced, and war was virtually declared against him. This was in 1680. Those who are ready to condemn such a proceeding must remember that only eight years afterwards, in 1688, the whole country endorsed the doctrine of the Sanquhar Declarationists, and pronounced rebellion in this case to be patriotism. A price was set on Cameron's head, and, consistently with his whole character and position, being surprised by the troopers, with a band of friends, at Aird's Moss, in Ayrshire, on the 22nd July, 1681, he died sword in hand. "He lived," said one of his enemies, "praying and preaching, and died praying and fighting!" To the societies already spoken of he bequeathed his name. Their members and adherents were called Cameronians. The Revolution Settlement, when it came, was not satisfactory to them; they refused to share in the benefits of the Presbyterian establishment, while believing such an establishment rightly constituted to be an ordinance of God; they adhered to all the covenants and testimonies of the persecuting times, declining to esteem them less valid and reasonable when the persecutions had ceased; they continued to regard the government of the country even on its Protestant basis as unfaithful, and unworthy of any support at their hands. Under the name of Macmillanites they will be found spoken of, in no favourable terms, in the autobiography of the famous and godly Mr. Boston, of Ettrick. But the lapse of time brought broader views, a more Catholic spirit, a heartier interest in Christian work; recently they relaxed the strictness of their testimony,

at the cost of losing one or two of their more extreme clergy and congregations. They are now adorned with such names, well-known to fame in the theological sphere, as Symington and Goold, and are held in general esteem, though comparatively few in number—fifty congregations or so—under their modern designation of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

It is not enough, however, to trace the developments which have led to the present relative positions of the four Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, in the field of ecclesiastical controversy. Certainly, this is what strikes a stranger; and the Scotch are apt to be regarded as having a wonderful propensity to split their ecclesiastical system to pieces, for the sake of abstract theories or minor points of discipline; while, in doctrine, it is harmonious and pure throughout, and no one section can be held to be more signalised than the others by the presence in it of an earnest religious life. But the causes of strife and division lie deeper; the lines of demarcation are broader than at first appears. The Scottish mind is so keen to discern metaphysico-theological distinctions; so quick to apprehend a point of duty, a principle, a dictate of conscience; so little able to keep itself conveniently in the dark, and to let logical contradictions live together in harmony; that an insistence on the utmost purity of God's house has been ever connected with the highest spirituality, and a languid regard to that has betokened a fatal languor in matters of more vital importance. Faithfulness to the honour of Christ in His kingly office has been well understood to be an outward token of doctrinal purity and spiritual life. And so, when, to spectators from afar, the struggles of the Disruption and of similar periods seemed to be but the noisy strife of fiery ecclesiastics, they were felt at home as seasons of religious revival; great waves of power and blessing were rolling onward, strong and silent, and the agitations about the purity of the church were but their surface tumult, and the white foam of their tossing crests. The invariable connexion between the two is matter of history. The Robertsonian Moderatism of last century was a complex thing. The moderate clergy had no scruples about State supremacy in spiritual matters. But though that were forgiven them, much remained behind. Their theology was Socinian, so far as they had any theology at all. Their preaching was the preaching of men unenlightened in spiritual things; if it did not inculcate error, it was equally innocent of truth; they discoursed of practice and morals, and had nothing to say of

human sin and of God's redeeming love. And, as is always the case where virtuous practice is the sole theme of the pulpit, vicious practice was the habit of both preachers' and people's lives. The utter carelessness of the moderate clergy, and their addictedness particularly to the sin of drunkenness, were notorious among the Scottish people, furnished the subject of innumerable coarse drolleries, and, when any dispute arose about the functions of the church, made it scarcely possible for serious godly people to take any side but one—the side on which these men should *not* be. The Robertsonian period in the history of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, is portrayed with unconscious vividness in the autobiography of Dr. Alexander Carlyle, in which a distinguished moderate minister describes with approbation the manners of a time that the church of the present day looks back on with shame and disgust. To show the impression which it left on the vulgar mind, take the following anecdote, one of thousands. An old minister, a good many years ago, who had survived from these moderate days, and looked back on them as a golden age which had passed away, was bewailing, in the company of a young co-presbyter, the degeneracy of the times—the times, that is, immediately preceding the present. They spoke of the monthly meetings of presbytery, and he said, "Ah, sir! the presbytery is very different now from what it used to be. You hurry away to its meetings, and talk an hour or so, and hurry home again. It's nothing now to what it used to be. Man! when I was young, we were two whole days at a presbytery." "Dear me!" said the junior, "what did you do for so long?" "We drank!" was the reply of this *laudator temporis acti*. No better description of this party, which is not unknown in the history of other churches than the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, could be given than that of Sir Richard Hill. "A moderate divine is one who has a very moderate share of zeal for God. Consequently a moderate divine contents himself with a moderate degree of labour in his Master's vineyard. A moderate divine is too polite and rational to give any credit to the antiquated divinity of our articles, homily, and liturgy. And, therefore, he seldom quotes them except it be to show his contempt for them, or to torture their meaning; nevertheless, a moderate divine is ready enough to subscribe to them, if, by so doing, he can get an immoderate share of church preferment. A moderate divine is always very cool and calm in his pulpit; he never argues except when he is preaching against such fathers of Israel as the pious and lowly Mr.

Hallward; and then a moderate divine loses all his moderation. And so, I daresay, do the moderates of the Kirk of Scotland, when denouncing the principles and conduct of the evangelical and zealous servants of Christ who seek to do away with abuses which are favourable to moderatism. A moderate divine is usually an advocate for card parties, and for all assemblies except religious ones: but thinks no name too hard for those who assemble to spend an hour or two in prayer, and hearing God's Word." To take this as a description of the Established Church of Scotland, at the present day, would be a great injustice; but that it describes that party in the Church of Scotland which played the reactionary part in 1843, and which laid the foundation, and shaped the career of the present Scotch Establishment, need not be denied.

Consistently with all this, it is undoubtedly the case that the reaction against the Robertsonian Moderatism in church polity, which marked the years preceding the Disruption, was due to a revival of religious thought and life. The laurels won in that strife have been set on the brows of the able church-politicians, from Chalmers downwards, whom that stormy time produced; perhaps they were better earned by the godly ministers throughout the country, on whom and on whose flocks the Holy Spirit was poured out, and who through a hearty love to the Lord Jesus, rather than any views they had of abstract church-law, took the side of freedom, and stood fast in the day of trial which visited its chiefest bitterness on them. We understand better the change which passed on Presbyterian Scotland, when we look past the fighting men—the men strong in wordy debate, ambitious, eloquent—to such figures moving across the scene, and leaving a trail of light behind them, as Dr. Macdonald, of Urquhart, the Apostle of the Highlands, and Robert Murray McCheyne, of Dundee. These men, and many of their compeers, whose spirit was the same as theirs, were the true source of the Free Church's greatness, of the strong sympathy which it met with, and of those times of earnest evangelistic effort in all the churches which have followed the days of the Disruption. Had it not been identified with their hallowed memories and still living spirit—the same spirit of which Chalmers also, on a grander scale, was an impersonation, the spirit of evangelistic zeal and philanthropic effort; had it not been the case, as it certainly was, with exceptions of course, that the side a man took in the ecclesiastical strife could be discovered from the manner of his preaching and his prayers, from the

ardour with which he embarked in benevolent and missionary enterprises; all the eloquence and management even of such leaders as Drs. Buchanan and Candlish, would not have kept the Free Church alive, or only with a far dimmer and feebler life. The party which now forms the Free Church at once acquired a repute, like that of the older Scotch Dissenters, for godly faithfulness quite as much as for ecclesiastical freedom and purity. There is a kind of reproach which is the highest of all honours. On one occasion, long ago, as a good man who was present used to tell, amidst the company casually thrown together on the top of a stage-coach, were a swearing fellow and a grave and quiet person who happened to sit beside him. When the blasphemer was indulging in his profane and senseless talk, his neighbour turned and gravely rebuked him for his sin. "Ye'll be a Seceder!" was the fellow's retort, with a diabolical sneer. Whether it was really the case or not does not matter. None can fail to see how this taunt told *for* the Seceders, and *against* the National Church. When Disruption times came, the Seceders had many sharers with them in a reproach which was truest honour. A member of the deputations which were sent to preach in the moderate parishes of Strathbogie, at this moment a Free Church minister in the city of Edinburgh, happened to accost a man whom he met on the road in Aberdeenshire, and addressed to him some solemn words about his spiritual interests. "Ye'll be frae the Sooth?" was the very Scotch answer—a retaliatory question, which meant, as those acquainted with the circumstances know, "You must belong to the progressive party in the church, else you would not have spoken to me on such a subject." And it has ever been the same manifest presence of spiritual life and evangelistic zeal which has made nonconforming churches strong with a strength which is not human, but Divine.

These four distinct Presbyterian Churches exist in Scotland side by side: each with its own activities, its own historical position, and its own hold more or less strong on the community. The period at present running its course is manifestly one of transition. It is by no means likely that the next quarter of a century will leave things as they are. And so, in the past and present of the churches, we seek with a peculiar interest for auguries of the destiny of Scottish Presbyterianism. Their emulation of each other, their zeal for their respective principles, have covered Scotland with churches. Dissent, it cannot be denied, has ever been the most rapid and effectual mode of church extension. And,

however plausible in theory, it has been abundantly disproved in fact, that the church enjoying the revenues of the State must be the church of the poor. More will be found to be done, in almost every case, for the sunken masses, as they are called, by voluntary churches, with all their burden of self-support, than by those which are by law endowed and established. Dr. Chalmers' grand dream of church extension was fulfilled in an unexpected way. No doubt in Scotland the thing is overdone. In many quiet, rural scenes, will be found rival churches and congregations, one for each denomination—all of them sparse and thin, and kept up by pecuniary help received from a distance. At present that is inevitable unless there be great laxity of principle; and, when a living ministry supplants a cold and dead one, surely most desirable. Still, it has its drawbacks, and is one of those things which suggest to the minds of many the advantage of an incorporated union of Presbyterian Dissenters. And yet, it must be said, also, that there is much yet undone. The church accommodation is excessive in some places; in others it is too scanty still. The Free Church especially has laboured hard to supply the lack where it is greatest. The system of territorialism—that is, of marking off mission districts, and working them till they yield a church and congregation,—has been wonderfully blessed in the great cities of Scotland, whose dark places are intensely dark. Thirty years ago, the boldest, most sanguine dreamer would not have ventured to forecast the busy church-life of this day, the intense earnestness of aggression on the kingdom of evil, the sowing beside all waters, the multitudinous activities of religious people. Let us muster the forces of Scottish Presbyterianism, and contrast the present with the past.

In 1843, the largest computation of the ministers and congregations of the undivided Established Church gives their number as 1,203; and this, after the work of church-extension had been actively carried on for several years. Four years afterwards, the United Presbyterian Church, the Secession and Relief bodies now blended in it, numbered, according to the estimates which we have already given, 514 congregations. The missionary records of the Established, Free, and United Presbyterian Churches, containing the accounts for the past year, lie before us while we write; and from them we shall gather some idea of their relative strength and also relative zeal and liberality. The Established Church, including stations under the charge of an unordained

pastor, gives the number of its flocks as 1,239. There are differences, it must be remembered, in the size of flocks, which look well enough on paper, and each count one in the whole summation. It is alleged that, in some at least of the parishes, mainly though not solely in the Highlands, the bell of the parish church tinkles on Sunday as a mere matter of form, and the officiating minister is not sure by any means of a congregation larger than that formed by his family and domestics. Such a state of things cannot, of course, exist in nonconforming churches, where there are no *livings* to be held, apart from the flocks which they are intended to provide with spiritual nutriment and pastoral care; and, in their case, names of congregations must of necessity represent what *are* congregations in a more or less adequate sense. The Free Church, which consisted at the time of the Disruption of, at the utmost, 450 ministers and congregations, has rather more than doubled itself since then, and now numbers—including stations—913 congregations. The United Presbyterian Church, including nearly 100 congregations adhering to it in England and Ireland, now numbers about 600 congregations. Thus, in these three churches taken together, the difference between 1843 and 1865 is the difference between 1,717 and 2,752. We cannot doubt, that, though this increase arises in some measure from mere subdivision, it does represent, in some measure, also a step forward towards the evangelization of the country. In this work, none of these churches, has been idle. The Established Church must reckon Professor Robertson as its saviour. When the turmoil of the Disruption ceased, this vigorous and faithful man—perhaps seeing that the church which had sustained so enormous a loss was in danger of becoming paralysed and dead—perhaps to escape from painful thoughts and questionings in active Christian work—set agoing, fostered assiduously, and even wore out his life prematurely in behalf of, the famous Endowment scheme. It was a revival of the plan of Dr. Chalmers in another form; and had for its purpose the erection of new parishes, with livings endowed not by national grants, but by the proceeds of voluntary subscription. Before his death in December, 1860, by dint of almost superhuman efforts he had succeeded in founding upwards of sixty new parishes; had evoked a fountain of voluntary liberality and free effort in the Established Church of Scotland, which has good promise of being perennial; had saved it, in fact, on the brink of ruin, and enabled it to play again with heart and spirit a certain part in the religious life of

Scotland. It does not now, as at first, grasp, with the tenacity of a drowning hand, the supports of civil support and vested privilege, miserable substitutes for inward life and power; but displays a spirit of enterprise, an individuality of character, and a due apprehension of the wants and tendencies of the time—all of which it owes, more or less directly, to this endowment scheme of Dr. Robertson.

But, passing from statistics of this very superficial sort, we are able to make a better guess at the strength and zeal of these churches, by the statements of their annual contributions to the cause of religion which they themselves supply. The figures which we give must be taken approximately, inasmuch as different arrangements and different modes of computation may give to things a different look, and afford room for misunderstanding and disputation. The entire contributions of members of the Scotch Establishment to all the schemes of the church, we find set down as amounting to £76,233 3s. 7d.; those of the Free Church as amounting to £356,660 13s. 9d.; those of the United Presbyterian Church as amounting to £42,545 3s. 1d. In fairness to the others, it must be pointed out that the Free Church revenue is largely swelled by its sustentation fund—the central fund for the support of the ministry—the place of which in the Established Church is supplied by its endowments, and in the United Presbyterian Church by local contributions not included in this estimate. It amounts, for the last year, to £118,083 9s. 11d. Congregational, local, and miscellaneous objects consume upwards of £150,000 more. In the revenue of the Established Church we must in like manner particularise the endowment scheme, a scheme more or less directly of self-support, which receives of the whole sum above mentioned, £33,640 14s. 2d. Restricting our view to contributions for education and missions, we find the liberality of these three churches stand thus:—

	£	s.	d.
Free Church	69,812	4	5
Established Church	42,592	9	5
United Presbyterian Church	31,050	11	8

The liberality represented by these figures is a cause of thankfulness, and shows how times have changed. If a comparison is to be made, a great many things must be taken into consideration in order that it may be fair and trustworthy. This we fear, however, is at once made out; that the endowed church, shape its accounts as it may, is, in the matter of missionary zeal and munificence, although in

a great measure relieved of the burden of self-support, far behind its neighbours.

The month of May—that month so much associated with the Christian benevolence of the time—witnesses the annual assemblies of the great Scottish Presbyterian Churches. Then all accounts are balanced; all controversies *attempted* to be settled; the explosive vapours which have accumulated during the year are subjected to thorough ventilation; the churches deem another milestone on the road to be passed, and, with more or less of faith and hopeful energy, gird themselves for the exigencies of the future. The scene of their meeting is Edinburgh, at that season, perhaps, more beautiful than at any other—newly warmed with the breath of the tardy northern spring—wrapping the fresh leafage round its crags—lying in sunshine between the Firth of Forth and the Pentland Hills, with its bold but graceful outlines, and streets open to all the winds of heaven, and gardens gleaming greenly everywhere, and its sea seen afar with its many ships, like a blue heaven traversed by white-winged birds—the city of a poet's dream. The two assemblies of the Established and Free Churches are to be found on the Castle Hill, with only a narrow street between the halls in which they meet. Across the gardened valley, in the New Town, meets the synod of the United Presbyterian Church. The rivals on the hill seldom separate without exchanging shots; the leaders especially, whose recollections of the days of conflict are like ineffaceable scars, are great in contemptuous allusions, in which it is customary to abstain from even naming the church to which reference is made. The feuds of kinsfolk and near neighbours, it is well known, are always peculiarly deadly. We shall give the precedence to the State-endowed denomination. We shall pass beneath the singularly graceful spire which surmounts the entrance to its hall, and enter into the presence of its august general assembly. The moderator, or president, for the year, is Dr. Macfarlane, of Duddingstone, a portly personage, who is the author of a book on "The late Secession," as he calls it—the Disruption to wit; which is a curious rigmarole, not without a certain ponderous vivacity. Behind and above him sits Lord Belhaven, the representative of Her Majesty, and the visible pledge of State recognition and State support; and now, also, alas! of State supremacy. All the old formalities are kept up in this assembly; lawyers, for example, plead at its bar in wig and gown; but the galleries appropriated to the public are sure to be sparsely filled. It would never occur

to any visitor that this is the National Church of Scotland; the shell is certainly still there, but the kernel of life and influence is in great measure gone. A few steps will take us into the presence of the Free Church Assembly. We feel ourselves at once in a warmer atmosphere. Through the crowds of loiterers in the corridor we make our way, into, perhaps, the finest hall in Edinburgh; for which this church has exchanged dingy Tanfield, of glorious memory. Two galleries are filled with ladies, who spend the whole day in listening to the discussions, and eating biscuits or fruit, or even knitting stockings. The ladies have always mustered strongly on the side of the Free Church. They love the romantic and heroical; they are fond critics of clerical eloquence, of which here there is plenty; but better still, they, some of them at least, are not unworthy followers of the women who ministered of their substance in the Gospels. They collected the funds for building this beautiful hall, and therefore have a right to use it. It is thought that, sometimes, their presence in the gallery affects the judgment of the house, and that they are able to confer on their favourite speakers a disproportionate influence. The first sounds we hear when we enter, will most likely be the stumbling speech of Dr. Gibson, or the smoothly-flowing tones of Dr. Robert Buchanan, or the ringing voice of Dr. Candlish. These are members of a little group of leaders, who are returned, on one pretext or another, as representatives to every general assembly, and who have carried their leadership to an extent almost beyond what is compatible with the parity of presbyters, which the church professes to maintain. The peculiar circumstances in which the separate existence of the Free Church commenced account for this; it has been the source of great compactness and unity of movement; but it tends to produce in time a general listlessness and lack of interest; it puts a frequent taunt in the mouth of enemies; and against it some of the noblest and freest spirits of the Church have chafed in vain. It is alleged that a clerical humourist, who, of course, had "stayed in," preached to his people on the subject of the Disruption, the Sunday after it took place, from the text, 2 Sam. xv. 11: "And with Absalom went two hundred men out of Jerusalem, *that were called; and they went in their simplicity, and they knew not anything.*" The history of the Free Church has, in some measure, justified the application of the Scripture in which the wit indulged; for, in which so ever way the leaders have gone of late years, they have had little difficulty in inducing the rank and file of the church to follow. A prominent leader this year occupies

the moderator's chair—Dr. James Begg, of Edinburgh, a man of mark and distinctive character, who will deserve further notice, when we speak of the parties and tendencies of the time. We now wend our way to the meeting-place of the United Presbyterian Church, in Queen Street, facing across the blue waters of the Firth to the Fifeshire Hills. It meets as synod, that is, without any clerical representation, all its ministers being members of synod every year. Dr. Marshall, of Coupar-Angus, is moderator—a man of vigorous logical power, and keenly-flashing wit, a trenchant debater on the floor of the house, and a prompt and peremptory president in the chair. Here there is, perhaps, more varied and effective speaking than in the two assemblies. The peculiar constitution of this church-court, its non-representative character, accounts for that; and perhaps, also, the great freedom and intense progressiveness of this body, which is not so much bound by its traditions as the others, and throws whatever of talent and energy it contains to the surface. Here are many venerable fathers of the Secession and Relief Churches, who in their own lifetime have followed and shared in the greatest changes through which the religious body of which they are ministers has passed; and here are the young men, who have known the church only in its united state, and in whom all its impulses of freedom and progress most fully dwell. This also is manifestly a popular church, and its energetic clergy and teeming congregations exert a mighty and growing influence on many classes of the Scottish population.

The quarter of a century which has elapsed since the Disruption, has made many changes. It is long enough to have laid low in death many of the men whose names were most prominent, and whose influence was greatest, twenty-five years ago. The representative men of that period are almost all gone. Drs. Cook, and Mearns, and Lee, chiefs of the old school, enthralled by the traditions of the Robertsonian period, have passed away, and their spirit has in great measure departed with them. Professor Robertson, the representative of the sounder and more earnest State-churchmen, has also departed, with his touchingly simple utterances of Christian faith and hope. "I would have gladly remained a little longer, and worked God's work here, not as I would, but as I could, had such been His blessed will; but if He sees it best to take me now, I am ready. I am a poor sinful creature, but all my hope of salvation is in the righteousness that is of God in Christ. I place no confidence whatever in anything I may have done; my alone rest for

acceptance is in the righteousness of God by faith !” After a pause he continued, “And, as to Free Church and Established Church, I care not. Give me the man that has such faith. Him I respect and love. We shall be together united with God in Christ for ever !” Almost the earliest breach in the Free Church ranks was the death of Dr. Chalmers. No one can read Dr. Hanna’s Life, one of the noblest of biographies, the book to which the Free Church owes far more than to any other, without feeling himself in the presence of one of the greatest, not only of ecclesiastics, but of men, in any age or country. It is difficult to estimate the influence which he has exerted on the churches in Scotland. One is almost ready to say that the present age has been shaped to what it is by him. The start which the Free Church made, full formed, like the Tay from Loch-Tay, large almost at its source as at its meeting with the tides of the ocean, was due to him; he was the master-spirit, the all-pervading energy at least. He was one of those men who are always a generation ahead. And so, in the last volume of Dr. Hanna’s Life, it is only too plain, that even his immediate disciples did not comprehend him, nor rise to the largeness of his thoughts. His counsels, in many important matters, were rejected in the organization of his beloved Free Church; he was driven into retirement before the close of his life by the pushing ambition of meaner men. Only at present is his dream of the future of Presbyterianism in Scotland beginning to be understood. The finance of the Free Church owes to him its very existence; but, whenever it began to be, was taken out of his hands; and the day of retribution has come. On the subject of union with other churches, his fellow-churchmen are now almost at the point which he reached more than twenty years ago. We think that it could be made out in every particular, that, wherever the Free Church has realised the ideas of Dr. Chalmers, it has been true and great, and wherever it has departed from them, it has blundered and failed. So far as there is truth in Carlyle’s heroic theory, it might be applied here. This man and his time were one. Another great Free Churchman has gone hence more recently; the theologian of the church, Dr. William Cunningham. His influence as a theological teacher is only beginning to be felt, but will long continue to be felt in Scotland. Unhappily, he too, because his views on the subject of theological education were more advanced than those of his contemporaries, was driven from the ecclesiastical arena, to die amidst his books, and join the company of the great souls of other ages, with whom he had long delighted

Dr. Cunningham

to hold communion. The United Presbyterian Church mourns its most illustrious divine, Dr. John Brown, of Edinburgh. His Life is written by an admiring disciple, Dr. Cairns, of Berwick. A clerical family, long known and honoured in the Secession Church, bore in him its choicest scion. He is the father of Biblical theology in Scotland. He was the first to use openly, and confess the value of, the German exegesis. He insisted rigidly on letting the Scripture utter its own meaning in each particular passage, without reference to the theological system, at a time when to do so was a kind of heresy. "He was deaf," says Dr. Cairns, "to the charm of tradition, and could set aside the most venerable and time-hallowed misinterpretations without mercy. Nothing was more common from the pulpit than the sentence passed on some current sense: "This is truth, important truth, and truth taught elsewhere in Scripture, but not *the* truth contained in this passage." This was often repeated in the hall, with the more curt definition of an interpreter's business, "*Expositio non impositio*." His determination to satisfy at all hazards the demands of the words of inspiration, led him to maintain a certain *general* as well as *particular* reference in Christ's atonement, more strongly than seemed to be consistent with his professed Calvinism. The year 1845 saw him before the bar of the church, to answer to a libel,* which charged him with a departure from its standards. We suspect that the struggle was, between the rigorous dogmatical, and the freer Biblical, expression of the very same truths. The trial resulted in an acquittal, with which we may connect, perhaps, as its reward, the great and special eminence of United Presbyterian divines in the department of Biblical theology.

The worship of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, despite threatenings of change, is still very uniform. It consists of singing the metrical psalms (Francis Rous's version), two or sometimes three extempore prayers, the reading of a brief passage of Scripture, and a sermon varying in length from forty minutes to an hour and a quarter. The congregation sit to sing, and stand, in no very reverent attitude for the most part, at prayer. This mode of worship dates only from the Westminster Assembly, and is not, therefore, distinctively, either Scottish or Presbyterian. The great feature of the service, everywhere, and more especially in the congregations where innovations are most unacceptable, is the sermon. So much is this the case, that a Scotchman seldom speaks of going to

* The legal form, in which charges against an office-bearer are drawn up, for use in the pleadings at the bar of the church-court.

church or chapel, almost always of going to "hear" some particular preacher. A stranger from the south on one occasion visited the church of a popular Presbyterian clergyman, no matter where. He was somewhat late, and found that he had to wait out of hearing till the devotional services were concluded. A door-keeper comforted him by saying—"Ye'll sune get in. The doctor's no lang in getting through the *preleeminaries*!" A Scotch audience is able, or pretends to be able, to consume and digest as its Sunday meal an amount of theology which no audience anywhere else could possibly endure. There is some reason to fear that a good deal of the laborious doctrinal preaching common in Scotland is lost between the preacher and the hearer, or is almost utterly fruitless. Still it is due to and tends to perpetuate habits of thoughtfulness about divine things. The Scottish peasantry are sometimes exact and profound theologians. Early instructed in the Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism, and accustomed to hard-headed and logical preaching, they can conduct an argument in their own quaint phraseology, in a way which would astonish any one unfamiliar with the national character and habits. One good result of the great importance attached to the sermon in Presbyterian worship is, that the theological education of the Presbyterian clergy is of the most elaborate description. Over and above the years of study in philosophy and literature, four or even five are devoted to the study of dogmatic, historical, and Biblical theology. The consequence of this is, at present, a somewhat high average of able and cultivated preaching; and, as is usually the case, when the average is high, a rarity of outstanding names, and an absence of those electrical effects which great preachers are wont to produce. Dr. Chalmers has left no successor in his volcano-like force and power; Dr. Guthrie is laid aside from ill-health; and, with the exception of Dr. Candlish, who does not owe his reputation to his preaching powers alone, the honours of the pulpit are distributed among younger men.

The Scottish clergy and laity seem less easily affected by passing winds of theological opinion than the clergy and laity elsewhere. This is partly explained by the national characteristic already mentioned. The soil is not favourable to the reception and development of germs of broad-churchism or negative theology. People who have been drilled in the Assembly's Shorter Catechism are fond of sacrificing all things, even depth, to precision, and have no patience with any cloudiness of language or of thought. A scholarly and amiable

minister of the Free Church, in the remote Highlands of Scotland, became interested in the works of Maurice and Kingsley; and, perhaps unconsciously, while attached to the former truth, adopted an unusual phraseology in expounding it. His flock detected the change at once, and brought the authority of the presbytery to bear upon him. He was not disposed to suffer martyrdom for a mere manner of speech, and made the concessions required. Severer judges a man cannot have than his compeers in a presbytery; and so, in the nonconforming Presbyterian churches at least, heresy would be stamped out at the very moment of its appearance. Still, it would seem that the difficulties and testing questions of the day do make their voice heard even amidst the decorous orthodoxy of Scottish Presbyterianism. Ignorance of them at least is no longer possible. The shelves of Scotch ministers are crowded with translations from the German, published by Clark, of Edinburgh; and the names and writings of the Broad school are as familiar on the one side of the border as on the other. A stranger divine from England is said to have put to two eminent Scotch brethren, whom he knew to represent different schools of thought in the same denomination, the same question—Whether the perplexity and disquiet among thinking minds, which have been caused elsewhere by the writings of the Broad Church school, prevailed in Scotland? The first replied, “No, not at all! our thinking people are too firmly grounded in the faith to be disturbed in their belief by misty theologisings of that sort.” The answer of the other was to the very opposite effect; “Yes, a very great deal everywhere.” Betaking himself to a third clerical brother, the inquirer asked him to explain this strange contradiction. “Oh!” said he, “Dr. —’s intercourse is chiefly with the old women, and Dr. —’s with the young men, of Edinburgh!” We pronounce no opinion on these three replies which the inquiring stranger carried home, except that they had all three some reason at bottom. The truth may be held to be this, that, while among the clergy there is substantial agreement, the younger portion of the laity do feel and acknowledge the existence of doubts and difficulties. So long as he is beset by these, a conscientious Scotchman will not enter the church, but betake himself to some other profession. And there are many at present in Scotland who have not by any means gone over to the ranks of irreligion and infidelity; but who listen eagerly for the sound of a sympathetic voice endeavouring to lead them aright, and offering them a helping hand

from the tossing ocean of doubt, to the peaceful shore of faith. In Scotland, as everywhere, the Church must be militant in these days, must sleep with its armour on, for the enemy comes in like a flood, and the love of many is waxing cold.

Existing tendencies and men must be sketched together. The thoughts which are stirring in the general mind have ever their most articulate and advanced expression in some representative man. Biography, therefore, may become the most veracious, as well as the most vivid history. Abstract ideas thus receive a concrete representation; the doctrine of the schools is taught in the drama of human life. The Presbyterian churches, however alienated from each other, have all the same standards of doctrine, the same platform of church-government, the same directories of worship. When we come to speak then of character and tendencies, our field of view is very much narrowed. There are better and worse, safer and more dangerous, warm and cold; but the difference between them cannot possibly be great. And this also follows, that our representative men must be gleaned from all the churches; in all of which, more or less actively, the same tendencies operate. We avoid the word *party*, and prefer to speak of tendencies instead; for parties, distinct from each other, as the High and Low and Broad in the Church of England, for example, or as the Moderate and Evangelical, before the Disruption, there are not, in the whole Presbyterianism of Scotland, "bond" and "free."

In the matter of theology and general literature, the Presbyterian churches of Scotland, although they contain no sinecure offices, and their clergy are wholly a working clergy, are not undistinguished. The Free Church has its Fairbairn, and Brown, and James Buchanan, and Candlish: the first, the author of the "Typology of Scripture," learned, broad-minded, comprehensive, tolerant; the second, a charming expositor, uniting scholarly exactness with a tender spirituality of tone, something like Ellicott; the third, a clear, yet massive thinker, the author of more than one able book on the Christian Evidences; the fourth, an ingenious theologian, as well as expert ecclesiastical politician. It has its Guthrie, and Hanna, and Bonar, and Blaikie, the most eloquent of sermon writers, most chaste and classic of historians, sweetest of hymn writers, most genial of philanthropists; its Bannerman, and Robert Buchanan; its Walter Smith; its Islay Burns. The Established Church can point to Dr. Robert Lee, the most advanced of Scottish religious thinkers;

to Principal Tulloch, a theologian of singular refinement in thought and expression; to Dr. Norman M'Leod, the hierarch of popular religious periodical literature; to Dr. Caird, a preacher favoured by royalty; and A. K. H. B. *i.e.* Dr. Boyd, parish minister of St. Andrew. The United Presbyterians have their Eadie, famed as a commentator, their King, and Edmond, and Macfarlane, and Andrew Thomson, and Calderwood; above all, their Cairns, whose comprehension of the past, and sympathy with the present, whose happy union of conservatism and progress, point him out as one of the men who must shape more or less the period in the history of Presbyterianism which has now arrived. Our enumeration, we know, is most imperfect. The line of selection is hard to draw. From these, learn all.

But, owing to the peculiar church-life of Presbyterian Scotland, it is on the floor of church courts, and in dealing with the numerous questions which come or are forced within their sweep, that the tendency and position of the leaders of the Scottish Church become most apparent. Here we find two tendencies in operation—as indeed they are everywhere—conservatism and progress. In the Established Church, the progressive tendency has been most developed, and has caused what, but for the peculiar attachment to their minutest traditions of the Scottish Presbyterians, would be deemed a very groundless alarm. Doctrine, worship, and government, are the three particulars in which the Church of Scotland is proposed, by some of its members, to be reformed. Dr. Robert Lee is the champion of reform, and is much ahead of many who would on some grounds be classed with him, the Tullochs, and Milligans, and Macleods. He is engaged in issuing a treatise on reform, under the three heads already specified. Only the first part has as yet been given to the world, the part which treats of "Reform in Worship." It proposes some changes in the simple ritual of the Scottish Church, such as a combination of liturgical and free prayer, kneeling at prayer and standing at praise, responses, and the use of instrumental music. Such a proposal could not excite alarm, nor be held to betoken a return to Episcopacy, anywhere but in Scotland. What changes he proposes in the matter of doctrine and government, we do not know. His views of the former are suspected,—for which suspicion he has himself to blame,—of considerable breadth; his views of the latter are more free than many of his fellow-churchmen relish. He is the advocate of national education, and of voluntary liberality in support of the church. Taste and culture gain for him the

ear of the cultivated classes, and the regard of the younger ministers of the Established Church. There is some reason to believe, that, like all men who have strong views, and are little seconded in their own immediate circle, his opinions seem more extreme in the expression which he gives to them, and more contrary to what is generally accepted and held, than they really are. In the General Assembly of this year, he was signally defeated at all points, though he was able to summon around him more ability in debate than has been known in the Established Church since the Disruption. And yet the current would seem to be setting in the direction in which he points; for the organ, disapproved of, and all but expressly forbidden, by the General Assembly, is being introduced, with the consent of presbyteries, into many congregations of the Established Church. Other men, more likely, perhaps, to move the Church itself, though less likely to reach the ear of the public, have gone further than Dr. Lee, and laid themselves open to the charge of aping Episcopacy. A former moderator, Dr. Bissett, of Bourtie, in one of his addresses from the moderator's chair, advised an adoption of certain changes in the Presbyterian ritual; nay, even in the Presbyterian church-government; with the explicit purpose of staying the flight of the upper classes in Scotland to the Episcopal Church. It must be confessed, that, how to avoid the evil of having different churches for different classes in society, for different grades even of culture and intelligence, is a problem of the day in Scotland and elsewhere. The solution, however, pointed at by Bissett of Bourtie, and other Established churchmen, would, there is little reason to doubt, dissolve the present Scotch establishment between Episcopacy on the one side, and nonconforming Presbyterianism on the other.

Progressive tendencies so pronounced cannot be discerned in the Free or United Presbyterian Churches, unless by one who brings with him a preconceived theory, or who listens to alarmist cries. We have spoken already of the only storm which has ruffled the calm, swift stream of United Presbyterianism. And, in the Free Church, the only heresies whispered about, have been a denial, on the part of some, of the divine right of Presbyterianism, and a refusal, on the part of some, to concur in the charge often brought against the Established Church, of having, by its Erastian compliances, deliberately denied and repudiated the headship of Christ over the visible Church. These are not heresies which could be made the subject of libel, or condemned otherwise than by awful head-

shakings on the part of the denominationally orthodox. Libels for heresy in the Scotch Presbyterian churches are rare, this being by no means due to any laxity of discipline; libels for immorality are not uncommon; and it is hard to say which would give reason for the profounder humiliation. The Free Church contains a strongly marked group among its leading men, who might be called Ultramontane in their views and position. Drs. Forbes and Gibson, of Glasgow—we refer mainly to the latter—are the most consistent and thorough-going of its members. They are—we mean, of course, not in natural character, but in view and position—of the hardest grain, of the most antique conformation, and have come into the world two centuries too late. They worship the seventeenth century, and swear by all its Shibboleths. The former is a great mathematician: the latter, a laborious writer on “Man’s natural and moral inability.” They hate and fear all that bears the name of progress. On every question which has arisen, they have taken up the most intolerant and condemnatory position. Their most recent struggles have been against the proposed union of Presbyterian dissenters. Beside these, though he is a man of wider sympathies, a social reformer and philanthropist, must be set the present moderator of the General Assembly, Dr. Begg. His addresses from the moderator’s chair are as angular, sectarian, and denunciatory, as it was possible for him to make them. The pins of the tabernacle are as sacred to him as its golden vessels, its ark, and incense altar. He will not suffer an attitude in worship to be changed if he can help it. The requirements of the time receive nothing from him but anathemas or contemptuous neglect; his idea of improvement is a return to the opinions, and more especially the phraseology, of the Puritan and Covenanting period. Dr. Begg, the advocate of extended franchise and co-operative societies, and improved houses for the working classes, and Dr. Begg, the moderator of the General Assembly, rigid and conservative in the last degree, are not easily reconciled. These leaders draw their following from a certain class of country elders, mostly engaged in the practice of agriculture, and from the clergy of the remote highlands and islands of Scotland; and their power is on the wane. Dr. Robert Buchanan, of Glasgow, and Dr. Candlish, of Edinburgh, in whom the Free Church enjoys a double head, much more harmonious, however, than the Popedom of Rome and Avignon, cannot be classed as decidedly conservative or decidedly progressive. By heart and inclination they are understood to be the latter; by politic necessities they are

often made to appear the former. If they have been a little peremptory, it must be admitted that they have steered the ecclesiastical ship well; a little too craftily, a little too timeservingly, a little too much after the maxims of human expediency; but still well. They have held the reins and whip, to change our figure, sometimes restraining an impetuous, sometimes hurrying on a laggard, steed; and they can be trusted, if they are not constrained to fall into the arms of those on either side of them, to take the lead in safe and useful change. Behind these leaders are new powers of thought and life, voices of the new age to which swift heed must be given: the post-Disruption Free Church, with its eager pressure onwards, not to dissolve, but to unite, not to preach Free Churchism, or Presbyterianism, to the world, but the great coming kingdom of Christ. Here are men, pondering thoughtfully on the thousand doctrinal questions of this troubled age; facing its doubts, and endeavouring to deal with them in the firmness of faith and the tenderness of sympathy: here are ardent souls, baptized with fire, who have given themselves with heart and might to the movements of religious revival in the Church and country; here are the advocates of union, who see in one great nonconformist Presbyterian Church, the hope of Scotland; here are the reformers, if they can be so called, who would serve God with the best, who advocate improved church-architecture—a worship divested of its roughness, while retaining its simplicity—a ministry able to reach the highest class as well as the lowest, the learned and unlearned, the rich and poor, and gather them all into the same fold—a removal of those peculiar strictnesses, such as the prohibition of the use of hymns in public worship, which separate the Free Church from all its sister-churches, and involve it in inconsistencies—a larger tolerance and more catholic spirit. These are the hope of the church of the Disruption, a token of its unquenched vitality, a pledge of its continuance. The voice of the benevolent Dr. Guthrie is silent; Dr. Hanna has forsaken the arena of church business for literary retirement. To Dr. Blaikie, Dr. Islay Burns, Principal Fairbairn, Dr. Horatius Bonar of Kelso, Dr. Brown of Aberdeen, Mr. Arnot of Edinburgh, to mention no younger men, the representation of the Free Church which is, and is to be, especially belongs.

There are those also in the United Presbyterian Church, who, on their part, are grimly conservative; making the most of their distinctive badge, the voluntary principle, and striving to erect it into, what it has never yet been, a term of communion among ministers and people. In that church, however,

the large and liberal spirit of Drs. King, and Harper, and Cairns, seems to sweep all before it. An address of Dr. King, in the United Presbyterian Synod, when the first overtures of union among nonconformist Presbyterians were proposed to be made, and the conferences were originated, two years ago, melted the resistance of every heart by its genial warmth; and Dr. Cairns, at an aggregate meeting in the Assembly Hall of the Free Church, in May last, speaking on the seemingly neutral subject of the Church abroad, carried his hearers, with all their shades of opinion, up to a mount of vision, and obliged the blindest to behold, not far off, but near, the promised land of unity, and life, and heavenly blessing. The church, which still bears in popular speech the name of Richard Cameron, has not been behind its neighbours in sympathetic ardour; and by its Goold, and Binnie, and Graham, has spoken frank words, and stretched out friendly hands. We can scarcely doubt, that, for the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, the present is a transition period, and the coming years are big with change—change in the direction of Christian union, of freer and yet equally sound theology, intenser evangelistic activity, less conventional and more simple and ardent religious life. The ranks of the Episcopalian Church may gain something when the Presbyterian ones are sifted as wheat; the Scottish Establishment may next be threatened with, and may endure, the fate which impends already over the Established Church of Ireland; but the vision which our review of Scottish Presbyterianism as a whole most surely suggests, is of a nonconforming church, wide in its influence, vast in its numbers, addressing itself with heart and might to the evangelization of the world; cherishing, but not slavishly, the spirit of the Puritans, the spirit of the Covenanters, the spirit of the Erskines, and Gillespie, and Chalmers; linked in close fellowship with all other evangelical churches; and watching and waiting for the time when the oneness in Christ of all true believers shall be visible and manifest, as it is hiddenly real now, and, in its own unseen, undreamt-of glory, humbling all human ideals, the kingdom of God shall fully come.

ART. II.—*Lectures on the Revelation of St. John.* By C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D., Vicar of Doncaster. Second Edition. Two Vols. London and Cambridge: Macmillan and Co. 1865.

It is not often that a continuous exposition of the Revelation is attempted from the Christian pulpit. Nor is this to be wondered at. The book itself, indeed, is fraught with interest, and must ever attract the devout and earnest mind: but among those who have studied it with the greatest care, many, it is probable, have been dissatisfied with the schemes of interpretation which they have met with; and even if some scheme has, in its general features, commanded their assent, they have felt serious misgivings as to the exposition of particular portions of the prophetic imagery. The attempts, also, that have been made to trace out the probable history of the nations, and to form an approximate estimate of the time of some great crises in the destiny of this world, have caused many minds to recoil with solicitude and distrust. We know that some devout students of this book have risen from the perusal of elaborate works upon it, with a deep conviction of the uncertainty of any scheme of prophetic anticipation founded upon its symbols. Such persons have naturally turned to the plainer portions of Holy Scripture, as the basis of their public ministrations: occasionally, perhaps, selecting parts of the Revelation, the bearing of which is clear and obvious, but avoiding any attempt to explain in regular order its grand and majestic imagery. But the Lectures of Dr. Vaughan, delivered in the years 1861 and 1862, in the parish church of Doncaster, the second edition of which has been recently published, show that it is possible to make the continuous exposition of the Revelation both interesting and instructive. There is a freshness and a manly earnestness in every part of the volumes before us. Dr. Vaughan attempts not to solve every difficulty which the Apocalypse presents. With the candour and fidelity which become the interpreter of God's Word, he lays down the principle, as he enters upon the explanation of the more mysterious portions of it, "that where we doubt we must say so, and where we are in the dark we must say so." But, treading thus carefully and reverently, he brings out of this Divine Record truths of profound import. We have seldom, indeed, perused discourses which so rivet the attention, and the interest of which is so uniformly

*The true system of interpretation -
Mr. E. H. H. - and the importance of Dr. Vaughan's*

sustained : and we may point to the faithful, heart-searching appeals with which the Lectures generally close, as admirable specimens of the manner in which a Christian pastor should address the people of his charge.

Several preliminary questions affecting the Apocalypse may now, we conceive, be regarded as settled. We may be assured, for instance, that it is the work of the Apostle John, and therefore that it justly holds a place in the canon of the New Testament. The external testimonies in favour of St. John's authorship are numerous and striking. Justin Martyr and Irenæus, in the second century, distinctly ascribe it to the Apostle ; and succeeding fathers of the church hold the same language. Dean Alford, in his *Prolegomena* to the Revelation, after a careful investigation of this subject, properly remarks, "The apostolic authorship rests on the firmest traditional ground. We have it assured to us by one who had companied with men that had known St. John himself : we have it held in continuous succession by fathers in all parts of the church. Nowhere, in primitive times, does there appear any counter tradition on the subject." So, too, the work itself bears traces of St. John's authorship. The simple manner in which the writer speaks of himself as John, without prefix or addition, must have led every Christian to think, in the first instance, of the great Apostle who had been honoured with our Lord's special friendship ; and only arrogance, or a wish to mislead, could have led any other John to assume this simple style. We know, too, from the testimony of early history, that the Apostle John was banished to the Isle of Patmos ; and, as we read the book, we find that the writer claims to rank with the prophets of the Old Testament economy, while he was made the medium of direct messages from the Lord Jesus to the ministers and churches of proconsular Asia. We may regard it as settled, also, that the Revelation was written during the reign of Domitian, about the year 95 or 96. The opinion which has been held by some—as, for instance, by Moses Stuart, and several of the German critics,—that it was composed as early as the reign of Nero, is unsupported by historical evidence ; and the express testimonies of Irenæus, Eusebius, and others, fix it to the date above mentioned, and now almost universally admitted. The first of these writers says, "The Revelation was seen not a very long time ago, but almost in our own generation, at the close of the reign of Domitian."

The expositors of the Revelation have been classified as belonging to three different schools. There is the *Præterist*

school, who hold that, with the exception of the closing chapters, its prophetic symbols received a very early fulfilment in the Church's history. They conceive that it refers specially to the triumph of Christianity over Judaism and Paganism, as signalised in the downfall of Jerusalem and of Rome. But the objections to this scheme are numerous and weighty. If the Apocalypse was written in the reign of Domitian, the overthrow of Jerusalem had already taken place. Many of the visions, also, which were presented to the Apostle, seem manifestly to point to great events affecting the Church in its varied conflicts with evil in the later ages of its history. Nor can it be regarded as at all probable, that in so extended and magnificent a series of symbolical representations the events affecting the Church and the world in the period immediately succeeding the time of St. John should be largely shadowed forth, and yet that the fortunes of Christ's kingdom during the long ages to intervene between that period and the ultimate triumph of His truth and His great second advent should be altogether passed over.

The *Futurist* school of expositors go to the other extreme. They conceive that, with the exception of the first three chapters, the whole book refers principally, if not exclusively, to events yet to come. Such a scheme of interpretation, however, is even less likely than the former to gain general acceptance. We might urge against it, as against the Præterist scheme, the inherent improbability, that, in so ample and elaborate a series of prophetic imagery, the grand features of the Church's conflicts and triumphs during so many centuries of its history would be wholly passed over, and that the visions would relate solely to the final struggles of the truth, and the final victories of the Redeemer. But, indeed, the very words of the Inspired Record itself disprove this hypothesis. In the opening of the book (Rev. i. 1—8), we have an explicit declaration that the events shadowed forth should very soon begin to come to pass; and when the august vision of God, as the covenant-God of His church, and as ruling over universal nature, was first unfolded to the reverent gaze of the Apostle, he was apprised that he should be favoured with a discovery of things which must be "after these" (*μετὰ ταῦτα*, Rev. iv. 1), an expression that marks the commencement of the fulfilment as immediately following the time then present. Equally decisive on this point are the declarations with which the prophecy closes:—"And he said unto me, These sayings are faithful and true; and the Lord God of the holy prophets sent His angel to show unto His

servants the things which must shortly be done." (Rev. xxii. 6.) "And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book; for the time is at hand." (Rev. xxii. 10.)

The third class of expositors has been usually termed the *Historical* school,—since they have endeavoured to trace out the fulfilment of the prophetic symbols in the progressive history of the Church and of the world. But among those who are regarded as belonging to this school there are very considerable diversities. Two principal schemes of interpretation have been adopted, of which we may take the Rev. E. B. Elliott, and Dr. Hengstenberg, respectively, as the ablest and most accomplished representatives. The elaborate work of the former, entitled "*Horæ Apocalypticæ*," is, on many accounts, deserving of the attention of the student. It contains a mass of valuable information; and it evinces throughout the reverent care and untiring assiduity with which the writer applied himself to the study of this portion of the Holy Scriptures. Even when we are compelled to dissent from his conclusions, we cannot but admire his spirit, and feel that the highest respect is due to the sentiments of one who has devoted to the elucidation of this book years of laborious research and anxious thought.

According to Mr. Elliott, the Apocalypse presents to us, in a series of symbolical representations, the great events affecting the Church and the world in *regular and consecutive order*, from the time when St. John wrote until the consummation of all things. He considers, indeed, that there is a "supplemental, retrogressive part," which he supposes "to have occupied the *outside* of the Apocalyptic Scroll." This part is found in the twelfth, thirteenth, and part of the fourteenth chapters,—the visions of which Mr. Elliott regards as *parenthetical*, unfolding more fully some events to which allusion had been made in the preceding course of the prophecy. But with the vision of the angel flying through mid-heaven, "having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth" (Rev. xiv. 6), the history of the Church, Mr. Elliott conceives, is resumed at the point reached when the trumpet of the seventh angel sounded (Rev. xi. 15), and thenceforward the prophecy is continued in regular order until the winding up of the mediatorial economy, and the glorification of all Christ's people with Himself.

The scheme of Dr. Hengstenberg is essentially different; and it is this which Dr. Vaughan has adopted, at least in its distinguishing features, in the Lectures before us. According to Dr. Hengstenberg, we have in the Apocalypse groups of

visions, each of which shadows forth some great events affecting the Church's history, or places events already indicated under new and important aspects, and each of which reaches onward to the time of the end. His main position is clearly stated in one sentence of his Commentary; "The Revelation of St. John gives no regularly progressive disclosure of the future, advancing in unbroken series from beginning to end; but it falls into a number of groups, which indeed supplement each other, every successive vision giving some other aspect of the future, but which are still formally complete in themselves, each proceeding from a beginning to an end."* Dr. Vaughan states the principle in the following terms, at the commencement of his twentieth Lecture, in which he enters upon the consideration of the twelfth chapter: "We have seen in the Book of Revelation thus far, and we shall see in it hereafter, not so much one continuous stream of prophecy, starting from the times of St. John, and carrying down the fortunes of the Church with historical precision till they are finally lost in the great ocean of eternity; but rather a number of parallel streams, each marked by some definite purpose and principle, and each ending only with the end of time, even with that last discomfiture of the opposing powers of evil which shall introduce the universal reign of Christ, and usher in 'the new heavens and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.'"†

Now it is obvious that the conclusions at which we shall arrive, as to the events shadowed forth by the Apocalypse, will be very different, according as the one or the other of these schemes of interpretation is adopted. Thus, the opening of the sixth seal, which occurs comparatively early in the visions of St. John,—immediately upon which all nature appeared convulsed and agitated, and the mightiest of earth's potentates, equally with the humblest of our race, were thrown into consternation and terror, and said to the mountains and rocks, "Fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of His wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand?"—is referred by Mr. Elliott to the overthrow of the heathen imperial power by the victories of Constantine, and his avowal and establishment of Christianity; while by Drs. Hengstenberg and Vaughan it is referred to the visitations of judgment which will immediately precede the great consummation.

* Vol. i. p. 446. Clark's ed.

† Vol. ii. pp. 2, 3.

This instance will suffice to illustrate the fundamental difference between these systems of interpretation; and it will not, we think, be without interest to our readers, if we trace out the import of some of the Apocalyptic visions, according to these two systems, and then endeavour to adjudicate between their respective claims.

The earlier chapters of the book present no material difficulty. The glorious appearance of our Lord to the Apostle John, in the Isle of Patmos, will readily supply themes of reverent meditation to all who love to contemplate Him as "the First, and the Last, and the Living One," and who rejoice to think that, having once died for our sins, He now lives as the great High Priest of our profession, and the Head and Forerunner of His saints. The letters which he sent to the "angels" of the seven churches of proconsular Asia are of thrilling interest, and suggest the most admonitory lessons. It is at the fourth chapter that the visions commence, which unfold to us in symbol the events of the future. St. John was rapt in ecstasy; and a scene of wonder and magnificence was opened to his view. He was permitted to gaze upon a throne set in heaven on which One sat whom he attempts not to describe, but of whom he only says, that "He that sat was to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone," the commingling lustre of the two symbolising the dazzling brightness of the Divine purity, and the terrors of God's punitive righteousness; while around the throne there was the rainbow, the beautiful emblem of the covenant of mercy. On twenty-four thrones around, the Apostle beheld twenty-four elders sitting, clothed in white robes, and having on their heads crowns of gold. From the throne itself there issued lightnings, and thunderings, and voices; and before it seven lamps of fire were burning, the symbol of the diffusive, penetrating, sanctifying power of the Holy Ghost. Four living creatures, presenting varied forms, but distinguished by intelligence, and actuated by devotion, appeared upon the scene, in the middle space before the throne and around it; and the Apostle listened to their song of adoration addressed to the Eternal One, before whose holiness and omnipotence they bowed with lowly reverence, and then he marked how the elders took up the strain, and rising from their seats, and falling prostrate before Jehovah, acknowledged Him as the Source of being, and the Fountain of all good.

As the Apostle looked upon this vision, he saw, in the right hand of Him who sat upon the throne, a roll, written both on the inside and the outside, and sealed with seven seals. And

now an angel comes forth and proclaims, "Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof?" but no response is heard, and no creature in heaven or on earth claims that as his right. But then the adorable Mediator, "the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David," who appears in the vision as a Lamb slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which, it is added, "are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth," comes forward, and takes the book out of the Father's right hand. Before Him the living creatures and the elders fall in adoration and thanksgiving, acknowledging His redeeming work; while from the angelic hosts, and from the whole creation of God, the anthem of praise and adoration ascends to the Lamb as well as to the Eternal Father.

And now the seals are opened; and as each is broken, a new figure appears upon the scene. First, there comes forth a white horse, the rider of which holds a bow, and a crown is given to him, and he goes forth "conquering and to conquer." Next, a red horse, and in the hand of him that sits thereon, a great sword, that he should "take peace from the earth." Then there comes forward a black horse, the rider holding a pair of balances in his hand, while a voice from the midst of the four living creatures proclaims that there should be scarcity, yet not absolute want,—the mercy of God tempering the severity of judgment. When the fourth seal is opened, a pale horse appears, the rider of which is Death; while a symbolical figure, representing Hades, follows him. As the fifth seal is broken, the Apostle beholds an altar, resembling, doubtless, the altar of sacrifice in the court of the temple, and beneath it the souls of those who had suffered martyrdom for Christ, whose blood, indeed, cried for vengeance upon the ungodly, but who themselves rested in peace and holy joy. Then comes the opening of the sixth seal, when all nature is thrown into consternation, and a universal feeling of dismay seizes all who are not secure in the consciousness of a saving interest in Christ. And now there is an interlude; and before the seventh seal is opened, four angels appear, commissioned to inflict judgments on the earth; and another angel, "having the seal of the living God," comes forward and charges them to pause until the servants of God are sealed. Then the Apostle gazes with holy joy upon the vision of the great multitude before the throne, clothed in white robes, and having palms in their hands, listens to their ascriptions of praise, and is instructed by one of the elders in their past character and history, and their present state of

glory and happiness. After a little while, the seventh seal is opened; and "there is silence in heaven about the space of half an hour."

Here, according to Dr. Hengstenberg and Dr. Vaughan, the *first group* of visions ends; and we may, therefore, properly pause to compare the two systems of interpretation which we are considering. Mr. Elliott regards the white horse and his rider of the first seal as indicating an era of *prosperity and victory* to the Roman Empire. Such a period was that which intervened between the death of Domitian, A.D. 96, and the year 185, in the reign of Commodus. The second seal, bringing upon the scene the red horse and his rider, represented an era of *civil war and bloodshed*, caused by the *military power*; this era commencing in the year 185. The black horse, and his rider holding the pair of balances, that came forth on the opening of the third seal, Mr. Elliott regards as symbolising a period of *oppressive taxation*, enforced by the *provincial governors*; and he shows that such a state of things existed from about A.D. 213 to A.D. 249. The pale horse of the fourth seal, with the accompanying figures of Death and Hades, represented a period that should be marked by the four evils of *the sword, famine, pestilence, and wild beasts*; and Mr. Elliott finds such a period from A.D. 249 to 292. The opening of the fifth seal indicated an era of *fierce persecution*; such persecution, however, being a repetition, though in a severer form, of the treatment which Christians had before experienced. Such an era was that from A.D. 303 to A.D. 311. But the sixth seal brings a great change upon the scene. This refers, according to Mr. Elliott, to the *overthrow of the heathen imperial power by Constantine*, and the *dismay* which his establishment of Christianity as the religion of the Roman Empire produced among those who had treated it with contempt, and had persecuted its followers unto death. He regards it as indicating the period which commenced A.D. 312, when Constantine triumphed over Maxentius, and which extended to the death of Theodosius, A.D. 395, the time, as he conceives, of the opening of the seventh seal. The visions recorded in the seventh chapter fall under the sixth seal, and intimated, first, that during this period the desolating tempests of barbarian invasion that were ready to burst on the Roman Empire, now nominally Christian, would be restrained; and secondly, that while the number of the professing church, the nominal Israel of God, would become very large, yet an anti-Christian system would secretly gather strength and diffuse itself among them, and only a *select*

number, the truly spiritual and holy, the "sealed" of the Lord, would really be His people. These, however, would be ultimately crowned with glory. And now, at length, the last of the seven seals is opened, and then occurs the memorable *silence* in heaven for half an hour. This Mr. Elliott considers to represent the *brief period of tranquillity* which intervened between the death of Theodosius and the bursting of the tempests which had been threatening to fall on the Roman Empire,—those tempests of woe and judgment which the trumpet-angels that immediately appeared betokened.

But upon the system adopted by Dr. Vaughan, this prophetic imagery has a different significance. He does not limit the state of things indicated by the horses with their riders to *distinct periods*, following each other in orderly succession, but views it rather as prevailing at different times, and as taken up by God into His plan of governing the world, and subordinated to the final establishment of the universal reign of the Lord Jesus. He considers that, by the first horse, "the suffering and oppressed church of the time of St. John was taught to connect the idea of *conquest*,—of such victories as those which had extended, and were to extend over the whole known earth, the dominion of imperial Rome,—first with the overruling sovereignty of God, out of whose presence and by whose edict all human power goes forth; and, secondly, with the final establishment of a power not human, even with the coming of Him who is the Lord of the Church, and to whom all the kingdoms of the earth shall eventually be made to bow."* In a similar manner, he regards the second, third, and fourth horses with their riders, as showing that *civil war*, *scarcity*, and *widely diffused mortality*, are all under the control of God, and that, whatever temporary sufferings they may bring to Christ's people, they will all be overruled for eventual good to the cause of Christ upon earth: The fifth seal unfolds a different scene, and intimates that the *persecution* of Christ's faithful people should often mark the history of the Church and of the world, but that even this should prepare the way for the great consummation, and, when rightly understood, was a sign, not of the discomfiture of Christ's truth, but of the certainty of His coming to judgment. The immediate preparations for that great event, with the overwhelming terror which shall then fall on the ungodly, are set forth as the sixth seal is opened. After citing the words of the prophecy, and adding from the ancient Scriptures passages in which similar

figures are found, Dr. Vaughan says, "Whatever secondary fulfilments this opening of the sixth seal may have found in history; as in the fall of the Roman Empire, or in the destruction of idolatry, or in the demolition of any great persecuting and oppressing power in any age of the world; who does not feel as he listens to it, that it has one, and can have but one, full and exhaustive accomplishment, in the events which shall precede and usher in the second coming of our Lord Himself for judgment?"* But here, though everything seems ready for the appearance of the Lord, to overwhelm His foes with visitations of His righteous displeasure, there is a pause, to mark the *security* of His faithful people. Before the angels who are commissioned to bring judgment upon the earth, and that judgment one that shall come from every quarter, execute their work, the true servants of God are to be "sealed," and thus marked out as secure when the threatened visitations of wrath descend. Nor only as secure. Before them is a state of lofty and unmixed enjoyment, of intimate fellowship with God, and of high and everlasting triumph. And now, at length, after this twofold interlude,—the vision of the sealing, and the vision of the saints in glory,—the signs consequent on the opening of the sixth seal, signs which ushered in the second advent of the Lord from heaven, are followed by the great event itself. The seventh seal is broken, and the end is reached. But, as yet, no disclosure is made of the transactions of that momentous day. "One single verse," says Dr. Vaughan, "announces to us all that is here to be told of the great consummation. We shall see reason to doubt whether the book itself, the sealed book, the book which the Lamb takes out of the right hand of God, and of which He has now broken each successive seal, is ever read to us; whether its contents are not rather reserved for a future state, to be the subject of satisfying and adoring meditation through the ages of the eternal age. The breaking of each of the first six seals is followed by a new sign, a new scene, a new disclosure; but the consequence of the opening of the seventh seal is not sign nor scene, not speech nor disclosure, but silence: it is the signal for the dropping of the curtain upon the scene of vision, and when it rises again, it is for a new act, with other performers, and amidst altered circumstances. The impediments are removed, the scroll is spread, the Divine Reader is prepared: but the actual reading is not for earth, but for heaven; they who would understand the whole counsel of God must first lay

* Vol. i. pp. 207, 208.

aside the body, and receive their final *adoption* by becoming *children of the resurrection*.”*

Before we inquire into the comparative probability of these two systems of interpretation, it will be desirable to extend our views, and consider the second group of visions,—that of the trumpet-angels, which, according to Drs. Hengstenberg and Vaughan, not to speak of Dean Alford and other expositors, again brings us to the end of all things, while on Mr. Elliott's theory it carries on the development of the history of the Church and the world from the year 395 until a period comparatively near to our own time.

After the mysterious and impressive silence in heaven, which followed the opening of the seventh seal, seven angels holding trumpets appeared upon the scene, while another angel with a golden censer came and stood at the altar. Four of these angels successively blew their trumpets, and strange and terrible sights immediately followed, evidently betokening suffering and calamity to men. (Rev. viii. 6—12.) Then came a pause, and another angel, flying through the midst of heaven, proclaimed, “Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth, by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three angels, which are yet to sound.” As the fifth angel blew his trumpet, a star was seen to fall from heaven, and the abyss was opened, and out of the smoke that issued from it there came forth locust-forms, ruled over by Apollyon. (Rev. ix. 1—11.) When the trumpet of the sixth angel was sounded, a voice from the golden altar before the throne of God said to that angel, “Loose the four angels which are bound in the great river Euphrates;” and instantly the command was obeyed. The angels, “prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men,” were loosed, and vast hordes of cavalry appeared upon the scene, their riders having breastplates of fire, and jacinth, and brimstone, and the horses having heads like lions, while out of their mouths issued fire, and smoke, and brimstone. Between this trumpet and the seventh there was a long pause, and other visions met the reverent gaze of the Apostle (Rev. x. xi. 1—14); but at length the seventh angel sounded, and great voices in heaven proclaimed, “The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever,” while the four and twenty elders rose from their seats, and, falling prostrate before Jehovah, adored His majesty, and acknowledged the manifes-

tation of His glory and power, both in the rewards now to be conferred on His servants, and in the judgments with which He was about to visit the ungodly and the unjust. (Rev. xi. 15—19.)

Mr. Elliott's exposition of the symbols which followed the sounding of the seven trumpets is remarkably elaborate; and as we trace in detail the events which he conceives some of them to have prefigured, we find several coincidences that strike us as singular and worthy of careful attention. On the sounding of the first trumpet, "there followed hail and fire mingled with blood, and they were cast upon the earth, and the third part of trees was burnt up, and all green grass was burnt up." This Mr. Elliott refers to the invasion of Italy by Alaric, and the ravaging of Gaul and Spain by the army of Rhadagaisus. He considers this trumpet to embrace the period from A.D. 400 to A.D. 410 (the date of Alaric's death), or even later. This woe fell on the *inland* provinces of the western third of the Roman Empire, the capital of which, Rome, was thrice besieged, and at last captured. When the second trumpet was blown, "a great mountain burning with fire was cast into the sea; and the third part of the sea became blood, and the third part of the creatures which were in the sea and had life died, and the third part of the ships were destroyed." This Mr. Elliott views as prefiguring the conquest of the *maritime provinces* and *islands* of the western third of the Roman Empire, and the ravaging of the *coasts of Italy* by the Vandal fleets and armies led by Genseric. The period thus represented extended from A.D. 429 until the death of Genseric in A.D. 477. As the third angel sounded his trumpet, "there fell a great star from heaven, burning as it were a lamp, and it fell upon the third part of the rivers and upon the fountains of waters; and the name of the star is called Wormwood; and the third part of the waters became wormwood; and many men died of the waters because they were made bitter." This Mr. Elliott regards as indicating the ravages of Attila, king of the Huns, emphatically termed "the scourge of God,"—those ravages extending chiefly along the line of the Danube and the Rhine. This woe commenced in A.D. 450, about twenty years after the beginning of Genseric's career, and ended with the death of Attila in 453. On the sounding of the fourth trumpet, "the third part of the sun was smitten, and the third part of the moon, and the third part of the stars; so as the third part of them was darkened, and the day shone not for a third part of it, and the night likewise." This represented, in Mr.

Elliott's view, the abolition of the name and office of Roman Emperor of the West, in obedience to the command of Odoacer, chief of the Heruli, a barbarian remnant of the host of Attila, left on the Alpine frontier. This occurred about A.D. 476. But the period comprehended under this trumpet, extends to the ultimate extinction of the Roman senate and consulate, and thus reaches to the year 565.

Then came a pause,—an interval marked by premonitions of yet severer woes, which were, however, to fall chiefly on the *Eastern Roman Empire*.

The terrible imagery which met the gaze of the Apostle when the fifth angel blew his trumpet, is understood by Mr. Elliott as prefiguring the Saracenic invasion of Eastern Christendom; and he thus explains the various symbols. The *star* fallen from heaven to the earth represents Mohammed, who was by birth of the princely house of the Koreish, governors of Mecca, but who, through the death of his father and grandfather, was placed, in early life, in humble circumstances. The opening by him of the bottomless pit, followed by dense smoke, which overspread the earth and obscured the light of heaven, represents the introduction of the *false religion* which he taught and enforced. The *locust-forms*, which the Apostle beheld in the vision, imaged the cavalry hordes of Arabia, coming forth, under the impulse of their new religion, to make war on those whom they termed "the idolaters," while the command, "that they should not hurt the grass of the earth, neither any green thing, neither any tree," was in remarkable accordance with the established practice of Saracenic warfare. The period of *five months*, i.e. upon the year-day principle, 150 years, Mr. Elliott understands of the period of the intensity of the woe, which he calculates from A.D. 612, the date of Mohammed's public opening of his mission, to A.D. 762, the date of the removal of the Caliphate to Bagdad. It was during this period that the venom of the scorpion-sting—the bitter contempt and hatred of the Moslems to the Christians and their religion, making life itself in many cases a burden—was most widely diffused and most severely felt. After this time, the intensity of the woe was mitigated; the Saracenic power declined; until about the year 934, or perhaps 960 or 985, the woe may be regarded as altogether past. Then again there was a pause; and while the Greek Empire seemed to have regained its vigour, and to have before it a long course of prosperity, another woe was being prepared to fall upon its guilty people, addicted as they were to image-worship and various other evils.

With equal minuteness Mr. Elliott traces the correspondence between the prophetic imagery which followed the sounding of the sixth trumpet, and the events connected with the rise and triumph of the Turkish power, to which he conceives that imagery to refer. It was in the year 1055 that Thogrul Beg, the head of the Seljukian Turks, having been called by the Caliph of Bagdad to his assistance, was by that Caliph constituted and proclaimed "Protector and Governor of the Moslem Empire," and the secular authority of the Caliphate was delegated to him. In January, 1057, he went forth on his career of conquest, and every place which he assailed fell before him. After a few years he died: when his nephew, Alp Arslan, succeeded to his power, and continued his career of victory at the head of his masses of Turkish cavalry. The Seljukian princes conquered Asia Minor, and reduced Constantinople to the brink of ruin. But their power received a check from the crusades, and afterwards from an irruption of the Moguls under one of the generals of Zenghis. But though the Seljukian dynasty fell, the Turkman power was not extinguished. The various bodies of Turks were gradually re-united under the Othman princes; and the Ottoman Empire rose in its power and greatness. Its victorious armies entered the European provinces of the Greek Empire, and subdued them; and at length, on May 29th, 1453, Constantinople, the fortifications of which had resisted so many assailants, fell before the Turkish artillery, under the Sultan Mohammed, and the Greek Empire was destroyed. In retracing this history of the rise and progress of the Turkish power, Mr. Elliott notes the following points of correspondence between the symbolical imagery of the sixth trumpet and the character of that power. (1.) The Turkish armies came from the *Euphrates* to their work of destruction. (2.) They consisted, for the most part, of *cavalry*, the hordes of which were almost innumerable. (3.) The breastplates of fire, and jacinth, and brimstone, which the horsemen in the vision wore, indicated the *rich* and *varied colourings* of the attire of the Ottoman cavalry. (4.) The statement that out of the mouths of the horses there issued fire, and smoke, and brimstone, contained an allusion to the *Turkish artillery* by which the ultimate overthrow of Constantinople was effected. (5.) The remark of the inspired seer respecting the *tails* of the symbolical horses,—that "their power was in their mouths and in their tails; for their tails were like serpents, and had heads, and with them they do hurt,"—is considered by Mr. Elliott to have a striking illustration in the Turkish

42
126

standard of horse-tails, and in the fact that the Turkish Pashas, who committed grievous wrongs on those over whom they ruled, had their dignity marked as being Pashas of one, two, or three horse-tails. (6.) The statement respecting the period that should elapse from the commencement to the consummation of this woe,—that the four destroying angels “were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year” (a period which Mr. Elliott computes to be equivalent to 396 years, 118 days),—was precisely fulfilled, he thinks, in the time that intervened between the going forth of Thogrul Beg, January 18th, 1057, and the fall of Constantinople on May 29th, 1453. Several times, during this period, had the Greek Empire seemed to be on the very brink of ruin; but the Turkish power was restrained, and Constantinople preserved, until the predicted period of its overthrow had arrived.

Our space will not permit us to give at length Mr. Elliott's exposition of the visions which intervened between the sixth trumpet and the seventh. We can only mention that he regards the vision of the rainbow-crowned angel, in the tenth chapter, as prefiguring the Reformation of the sixteenth century, of which Martin Luther was the prominent instrument,—viewing the angel as the Covenant-Angel, the Lord Jesus Christ, and interpreting the little book in His hand of the open Bible, while he considers the words of the angel to St. John, after he had taken and eaten it, “Thou must prophesy again before many peoples, and nations, and tongues, and kings,” as addressed to him in his *representative character*, and as intimating the revival of the preaching of the Gospel by Luther and the Reformers. The visions recorded in the earlier part of the eleventh chapter, he regards as emblematical of the reconstitution of the visible evangelical church of Christ by Luther and his associates, together with the rejection of the Papal Church, as anti-Christian and heathen-like; and as intimating, further, that all through the period of Papal assumption and power, there should be a few faithful witnesses for Christ, and, in particular, two distinct lines of witnesses, until, at length, every voice of opposition to the Papacy should seem to be hushed; but only that after a brief interval the protest against its corruptions should be renewed in a bolder form by Luther. The ascension of the witnesses to heaven, Mr. Elliott understands of the *political establishment of Protestantism*,—the heaven to which they were called not being the place of Jehovah's throne, but the symbolical heaven of political greatness and influence. And now,

at length, the seventh angel sounds his trumpet, indicating, not the actual consummation of this world's history, but the arrival of a period which, though enduring for several generations, should prepare the way for it. The leading events of this period are shadowed forth, Mr. Elliott conceives, by the seven vials; while its general characteristics, as intimated in Rev. xi. 15—19, are the following:—It was to be an era of evangelical missions, and of the wide diffusion of Christ's truth over the earth; it was to be distinguished by some remarkable outburst of infuriated passion, on the part of the nations, against God and against each other; it was, further, to be a period of signal judgment upon the apostate nations of Roman Christendom and upon the Beast; it was to be a period in which God's faithful people would eminently recognise His hand, rejoicing in the anticipation of the approaching establishment of His kingdom, and in which, also, the Church of Christ would open itself to the world more than it had ever done before.

A less extended notice of Mr. Elliott's views of this part of the prophecy would not have done justice to his scheme of interpretation. And now the question arises, How are these prophetic symbols, many of which are so minute, regarded by those who do not view the Apocalypse as shadowing forth consecutively the course of human history, but rather as presenting, in groups of visions, certain events, or *classes of events*, which should distinguish the history of the Church, and of the world, each of these groups reaching to the great consummation?

Dr. Vaughan, in entering upon this section, gives prominence to the fact that the *trumpet* is a *martial* instrument; and he therefore regards the whole group of judgments falling under the trumpets as having *war* for its general subject. But we gladly turn to his own words, to unfold his views of the first six trumpets:—

“There is first seen a great and fiery hailstorm, typifying the desolation caused by that plague of war which is ever and anon in the course of centuries breaking forth anew to agitate, afflict, and enfeeble nations at enmity with God. Those who look carefully into the figures of Scripture, and throw the light of the Old Testament upon the New, find in the trees and grass, upon which that first judgment falls, emblems of those who are lofty, and of those who are humble in station; of the great men of the earth, and of the people. In like manner, in the second judgment, the mountain is the type of a kingdom; the burning mountain, of a kingdom upon which the fire of judgment is lighting; the sea, of the world and its nations; the sea

becoming blood, of a wide-spread loss of human life by the sword and its consequences. So again, in the third judgment, the star is a ruler; the burning star, a ruler on fire with the lust of ambition, conquest, and vengeance; the rivers are the emblems of affluence and of national prosperity; and their bitterness, of the poisoning, as it were, of the springs of such prosperity. And the fourth judgment, with its darkening of two-thirds of the lights of heaven, indicates long periods of distress and anguish, not yet, indeed, the last and most permanent of all, but still seasons protracted and repeated; *'if one look unto the earth, behold darkness and sorrow, and the light is darkened in the heavens thereof.'*

"For the fifth judgment, that of the plague of locusts, we have an inspired interpreter in the Prophet Joel. He has already used that terrible scourge as a type of hostile invasion; describing the inroad of the Assyrian host under Sennacherib in figures borrowed from those insect swarms. In the passage before us, many expressions are precisely the same with those of the Old Testament prophet. But there are some which belong wholly to this book. There is the opening of the bottomless pit by the instrumentality of a star in human likeness. The star is again, perhaps, a ruler. It is thrown from heaven to indicate the judicial character of that which follows: for heaven throughout is as much *the seat of judgment as the throne of grace*. The opening of the pit is followed by that rising smoke, the product of the fire of hell, which denotes the diffusion on earth of the diabolical spirit of cruelty and hatred. Out of this smoke come the locusts; out of the diabolical spirit diffused on earth come those desolating hordes of combatants which resemble the fatal locust-swarms, in their multitude, in their suddenness, and in their devastation. To the well-known traits of the locust is added, also, to complete the horror, the malice of the scorpion. To the likeness, marked also in Joel, of horses and chariots rushing to battle, is added here the crown which betokens sovereignty over the conquered, and the long hair, as of women, which amongst ancient nations was the sign of an uncivilized and barbarian race. But first and last stands the sign, the origination of this woe from Satanic influence, and its management throughout by Satanic agency.

"And thus we pass to the sixth judgment. A voice is heard from among the four horns of that golden altar on which lie for sacrifice the prayers of saints. It is the cry of God's oppressed people which brings down this judgment on the world of their oppressors. The judgment itself consists in setting free four angels hitherto bound; in giving scope, that is, to the operation of a particular agency thus far restrained by God's long-suffering towards *the world of the ungodly*. The angels are four in number, in allusion to the four corners of the earth, or the four winds; to express the world-wide character of the judgments foretold. The place of their binding first, and then of their loosing, is the river Euphrates; marked in the Old Testament as the boundary between the kingdom of Israel and the kingdoms of the

East, whether Assyrian, Chaldean, or Persian; as the limit from beyond which came the hosts of invading nations to make war upon the nations and upon the city of God. The Euphrates is thus used as a general emblem of the seat of God's hosts of war gathered for attack upon an unbelieving or apostate world. . . . Who the enemy is, against whom the hosts of the Lord are thus mustered, may be gathered from the twentieth and twenty-first verses. He is the world sunk in sin, and, therefore, hostile to the Church.

"And we shall understand that the predictions of these two chapters, like those contained in the section of the seven seals, are manifold, not single, in their fulfilment. Wherever war has been employed, under God's over-ruling providence, to humble pride, and to break up, as it has done again and again, overgrown and overbearing powers, there have these chapters had an accomplishment again and again; and each separate accomplishment has been, in its turn, a prediction and prognostication of the greatest accomplishment and of the last. Those hordes of invading barbarians which broke up the monster empire of Rome, and out of whose conquests modern Europe eventually grew, were one fulfilment—they were not the only fulfilment—of the prophecies on which we have dwelt to-night. Never were the figures of the locust-swarms, with their teeth as of lions, and their hair as of women, more strikingly exemplified than in those irruptions. But they did not exhaust the prophecies before us. When the mighty power of the French Empire, at the beginning of this century, was broken up by a coalition, as of God's hosts mustering for the battle against human pride and human ambition, then there was a new fulfilment, itself prophetic of another and another until the last of all. The words of God are manifold in their application, just because they deal not with instances only, but with principles."—Vol. i. pp. 281—286.

In the pause between the sixth trumpet and the seventh, occur the visions which Mr. Elliott regards as prefiguring some remarkable features and events of the Protestant Reformation. How are these viewed by Dr. Vaughan? The vision of the angel crowned with a rainbow—the cheering emblem of God's faithfulness, and in particular of His reviving and restoring mercy after a season of severe judgments—is designed, he thinks, to bring comfort to God's people by assuring them that the desolations of sin shall not go on for ever, but that there is a time fixed in God's counsels for the completion and termination of the present mixed state, and that the sounding of the seventh trumpet shall be the signal for the close of that which is. The little book in the hand of the angel he understands of the word of "the prophecies which follow in subsequent chapters of this book;" which, like all the other words of God, would be sweet and attractive to the truly

pious, and yet, when digested, would awaken a painful solicitude for the condition of those who rebel against the Divine authority. The visions which form the second part of this interlude (Rev. xi. 1—13) are designed, according to Dr. Vaughan, to shadow forth the state of the visible Church during the judgments indicated by the six trumpets. The measurement of the temple and altar, while the outer court was excluded, was intended to mark "the safety, because the indelible consecration, of God's true servants; the certainty that there will always be upon earth, in the worst of times, in the most degenerate of nations, a little remnant of *called, and chosen, and faithful*; always a true shrine in which these worship apart from the *strife of tongues*, and an accepted altar of burnt-offering, on which lives and souls are constantly dedicated through the mediation of the one High Priest and in virtue of His one sacrifice."* The giving up of the holy city to be trodden under foot of the Gentiles during forty-two months, Dr. Vaughan thus explains:—

"When we translate the temple into its Christian sense, when we understand by Jerusalem *the city of the living God*, and by the Jewish people *the Israel of God*; we must also regard the Gentiles here spoken of, not in the first meaning of the term, as nations that belong not to the natural Israel, but rather as those who are not of the true seed of Abraham, not men of faith, not Christians indeed; and we shall see in the prediction here given the announcement of a desecration of that body which ought to be, and by profession is, all holy, by the admixture of many who belong not in heart and life to it. The shrine is to be measured; the court is to be left out. There shall always be a true Church, a true spiritual Divine temple; but there shall be appended to it a larger space, which must be described rather as an outer court of that temple, a community which partakes not in the true worship of devotion and self-dedication, and which, whatever its profession and whatever its name, is in reality a multitude without grace and without vitality."—Vol. i. pp. 315, 316.

But, throughout this period of partial corruption, even within the sacred precincts, there shall still be a decided testimony for God. His faithful servants are to "prophesy," to utter forth God's message; and to do this "in sackcloth garments, because their function is one severe and full of sadness; because they must be *in the world, yet not of it*, because their very garb and demeanour must testify against it, whether in its anti-Christian, or nominally Christian, part, *that the works thereof are evil*."† The "witnesses," Dr. Vaughan explains, "are the witnesses of revelation, the

* Vol. i. p. 314.

† Vol. i. p. 318.

witnesses of truth, the witnesses of the Gospel, the witnesses of God, the witnesses of Christ in every age, personified here as two in number; as though in memory of Him who sent forth His first disciples, not one by one, but *two and two*; as though to encourage the faithful witness of each age, we might say of each place and of each house, when he deems himself forsaken, with the assurance that he is *not alone*; not alone really in reference to human companionship, any more than in reference to that heavenly presence which is the essence of his strength and the fountain-head of his courage."*

And now, at length, the seventh trumpet sounds; and with it, according to Dr. Vaughan, "we reach the very prediction of the end; reach it, we may say, for the second time,—for we were brought to the same limit by the vision of the seven seals,—and yet, even now, not for the last time; there is more still to be told of the fortunes of Christ's earthly Church; and out of the completion of one line of prophecy will arise yet again the commencement of another."†

Here we must close the formal and extended comparison of the two systems of interpretation which we are considering; for our limits will not allow us to carry it through the whole of the Revelation. The question now claiming attention is, Which of these principles of interpretation is the right one? Does the Apocalypse shadow forth to us the events of the future, as far as they affect the Church of Christ, in regular and progressive order, bringing us at the close, and only at the close, to the end of all things; or do the visions that passed before the reverent gaze of the Apostle naturally fall into distinct groups, each of which brings us to that great and solemn issue?

At the first view, there is something attractive and imposing in the former scheme. It strikes the mind as likely to be true; and if only the imagery of this mysterious book can be consistently explained in accordance with it, it has much to recommend it. It is unquestionable that in the later chapters of the Revelation we meet with statements which mark a progressive preparation for the time of the end. We read of seven angels coming forth, "having the seven *last* plagues;" and soon after the infliction of the last of these, accompanying the pouring out of the seventh vial, there follows the overthrow of the mystic Babylon, and the counsel of God hastens to its completion. If we adopt the scheme of a *continuous*

* Vol. i. p. 325.

† Vol. i. p. 336.

development of the fortunes of the Church and the world, we feel how appropriate these statements are, and how fitly the close of the Apocalypse winds up the whole system that had been foreshadowed.

In reviewing, too, the expositions of the second group of prophetic symbols—that of the trumpet-angels—given respectively by Mr. Elliott, and by Drs. Hengstenberg and Vaughan, there are some things that, at the first view, are in favour of the former. There is a minuteness in the imagery which unfolds itself as the fifth and sixth trumpets sound, which seems to demand a more *particular* fulfilment than that which Dr. Vaughan's scheme assigns to it. We may refer, more especially, to the mention of the river Euphrates in connexion with the sixth trumpet,—to the innumerable hordes of cavalry which appeared upon the scene of vision, when the four angels who had been bound there were loosed,—to the breastplates of fire, and jacinth, and brimstone, which the riders wore,—while out of the mouths of the horses there issued fire, and smoke, and brimstone. It has always appeared to us that Mr. Elliott's interpretation of this trumpet, as referring to the rise and prevalence of the Turkish power, has a high degree of probability, though he has, perhaps, pushed too far his attempt to explain every minute circumstance of the Apocalyptic vision; and we feel a difficulty in regarding these symbols as indicative of a *class of events* which have again and again transpired in the world's history.

It may also be urged in favour of Mr. Elliott's view, that *some* of the numbers given in the Apocalypse seem to point to *definite* periods, rather than to general and indefinite ones, as Drs. Hengstenberg and Vaughan suppose. We refer, in particular, to the statements contained in the ninth chapter. In reference to the locusts that came out of the smoke of the abyss, when, as the fifth angel sounded, it was opened by one who, like a star, fell from heaven, it is said, "And to them it was given that they should not kill them, but that they should be tormented *five months*." So, too, on the sounding of the seventh trumpet, the command is heard to loose the four angels bound in the great river Euphrates; and the statement follows, "And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for *an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year*, for to slay the third part of men." Now, we confess that we feel a difficulty in understanding these statements of indefinite periods. As to the former, Dr. Hengstenberg considers that it is introduced simply with "the design of stamping this trumpet as incomplete in its character, as compared with the

seventh." "For this purpose," he adds, "the fifth number was well adapted. For it is throughout the signature of the half, the incomplete, as the broken ten. Five months are named, because only the five in relation to the twelve months of the year produces the idea of a proportionately long continuance and frightfulness, which was the thing more immediately to be rendered palpable. It was necessary to denote a very long period, and still not the longest."* Dean Alford adopts the view of several previous expositors, that the reason for the mention of five months is, that this is "the ordinary time in the year in which locusts commit their ravages;" and he adds, "At all events we are thus in some measure delivered from the endless perplexities of capricious fancy in which the historical interpreters involve us." To us neither of these views appears antecedently probable; and the prophetic statement seems rather to indicate a definite period during which the suffering referred to should continue. We should have less difficulty in acceding to the explanation given by Drs. Hengstenberg and Vaughan of the period of 1,260 days, or 42 months, or $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, which repeatedly occurs in the Revelation, that it is "the half-seven, the broken and imperfect, as opposed to the complete and sacred whole; which is again and again the designation of the reign of evil, of the humiliation of God's truth and of God's Church, as contrasted with that endless triumph of the cause of holiness and of Christ which shall comfort the sufferings of Zion and redress the wrongs of the saints."† We admit, too, that the thousand years referred to in Rev. xx. may well be understood of a lengthened but indefinite period; for the manner in which the phrase "a thousand years" is used in other parts of Holy Scripture seems fully to warrant this view. But the passages of the ninth chapter are different; and a scheme of interpretation which assigns to them a definite significance certainly deserves respectful attention. At the same time it is right to acknowledge, that the whole subject of the Apocalyptic numbers has peculiar difficulties. It is easy to perceive that *seven* occurs, again and again, as the number of perfection; that *four* is the number of terrestrial extension; and that *twelve*, with its multiples, is the number specially appropriated to the Church of Christ, and to arrangements connected with it. But when we proceed beyond this, we enter upon the region of uncertainty. The great question, whether a day is to be taken for a year, is far from being

* Clark's ed. vol. i. pp. 358, 359.

† Vaughan, vol. ii. p. 10.

settled; and we respect the candour of Dean Alford when he acknowledges the difficulties which surround both sides of this controversy.

"It is not my intention," he says, in his *Prolegomena* to the Revelation, "to enter the lists on either side of the vexed 'year-day' question. I have never seen it proved, or even made probable, that we are to take a day for a year in Apocalyptic prophecy: on the other hand, I have never seen it proved, or made probable, that such mystic periods are to be taken literally, a day for a day. It is a weighty argument against the year-day system, that a period of a thousand years (xx. 6, 7) does occur in the prophecy: it is hardly a less strong one against literal acceptance of days, that the principle of interpretation given us by the Seer himself (xvii. 17) seems to require for the reign of the beast a far longer period than this calculation would allow. So that in the apparent failure of both systems, I am driven to believe that these periods are to be assigned by some clue of which the Spirit has not yet put the Church in possession."*

But while the scheme of Mr. Elliott has some things to recommend it, the difficulties which attach to it, and indeed to any scheme that regards the Apocalypse as shadowing forth the events of the future in regular and consecutive order, appear to us to be insuperable.

One of these difficulties is the necessity imposed on the advocates of every such scheme of interpreting the sublime and awful imagery of the *sixth seal* of some event that took place at a comparatively early period of the Church's history. Mr. Elliott, as we have seen, refers it to the overthrow of the heathen imperial power by the victories of Constantine, and his avowal and establishment of Christianity. But we ask any one to turn to the passage (Rev. vi. 12—17), and, after reading it carefully, to say whether this event, in some respects so favourable, answers to that appalling description? Granted that the power which had persecuted Christianity then received a signal overthrow, was there anything to correspond to that *universal consternation*—that wild dismay, spreading through all ranks and all countries—which the prophetic statement depicts? Was there, on the part of those who were vanquished by Constantine, that *vivid and appalling consciousness*, which St. John's words imply, that their overthrow and punishment were not from a human adversary, but from "Him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb?" We well remember the disappointment, not to say the revulsion of feeling, called forth, many years since,

* Greek Testament, vol. iv. pp. 251, 252.

by this part of Mr. Elliott's work, when, with a favourable view of his general principle, we were carefully studying his "*Horæ Apocalypticæ*." We felt then, and we feel still, with Dr. Vaughan, that this passage "can have but one full and exhaustive accomplishment, in the events which shall precede and usher in the second coming of our Lord Himself for judgment." We agree fully with Dean Alford, that "any system which requires" the imagery of the sixth seal "to belong to another period than the close approach of the great day of the Lord, stands thereby self-condemned;" and that "a more notable instance of inadequate interpretation" than Mr. Elliott's reference of this imagery to "the downfall of Paganism under Constantine, cannot be imagined." But, adopting this view, we are shut up to the conclusion, that we have in the Apocalypse groups of visions, and that the first of these, at least,—that of the seven seals,—brings us to the time of the end.

This conclusion is strengthened by the manner in which the *silence in heaven*, following upon the opening of the seventh seal, is regarded upon the two systems respectively. Mr. Elliott is compelled to view it as intimating some fact in the progressive history of the Church and of the world; and he understands it of the transient period of tranquillity that intervened between the death of Theodosius, A.D. 395, and the bursting of the tempests which had been threatening to fall upon the Roman Empire. But when we turn to the statement of St. John, and listen to it in its simple majesty, "And when He had opened the seventh seal, there was silence in heaven about the space of half an hour" (Rev. viii. 1); when, further, we place ourselves, in imagination, in the position of the Apostle, and suppose ourselves gazing with reverence and awe upon the temple-scene which he beheld, and then mark how, upon the opening of this seal, instead of any new figure coming upon the scene, or any great commotion of universal nature, all was hushed, and heaven itself kept silence: we feel that we must refer it to the period of solemn, reverent, earnest contemplation of the perfections and administrative acts of Jehovah, which will follow the winding up of this world's history, when every opposing power is crushed, the ways of God are vindicated, and the mysteries of His government are solved.

We agree, too, with Drs. Hengstenberg and Vaughan in regarding the second series of symbols—that of the trumpet-angels—as bringing us again to the close of all things: and we cannot accept several of the views which Mr. Elliott

advances in his interpretation of this portion of the Apocalyptic imagery. His exposition of the fifth and sixth trumpets has, indeed, much to recommend it; but when we come to the visions which formed the *interlude* between the sixth trumpet and the seventh, several of his interpretations seem to us inconsistent with the simple majesty of the prophetic record; and we can scarcely believe that his reverent and devout mind would have adopted them, had they not been forced upon him by the great principle of his scheme, that the Apocalypse presents a continuous development of the history of the Church and the world. We will select two instances. The first part of the interlude consisted of the vision of the rainbow-crowned angel, which, as we have seen, Mr. Elliott refers to the great Reformation of the sixteenth century, of which Martin Luther was the chief instrument. One remarkable statement of the prophecy is, that when the angel had cried with a loud voice, "seven thunders uttered their voices." "And when," adds St. John, "the seven thunders had uttered their voices, I was about to write: and I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Seal up those things which the seven thunders uttered, and write them not." (Rev. x. 3, 4.) Now Mr. Elliott, applying to this case his principle of the *representative character* of St. John in these visions, *i.e.* that he represented the truly pious of every period, and especially the prominent instruments of God in carrying on the great spiritual work of His kingdom,—considers that this shadowed forth an important fact in the history and proceedings of Luther. That St. John was about to write what the seven thunders uttered, he refers to the fact that, at the first, Luther was disposed to bow to the Papal judgment, when directed against him, as if really of Divine authority; and the latter part of the statement—that St. John was forbidden to write the utterances of the seven thunders—he applies to the discovery made to Luther of the opposition of that judgment to the truth of God, so that it was to be disregarded and set aside, and to the discovery also of the true character of the Pope as Antichrist. From such an interpretation of the prophetic record, we recoil; it does not accord with its simplicity and grandeur; and we rest in the first and most obvious thought suggested by it, that not everything that met the ear of St. John in these visions was to be disclosed to men and written down for their instruction, just as St. Paul, when caught up to the third heaven, heard unspeakable words, which were never to be communicated to the Church below.

Equally objectionable, in our view, is Mr. Elliott's interpretation of the reception into heaven of Christ's two witnesses, in the second part of this interlude. The prophetic statement of St. John is, "And they heard a great voice from heaven saying unto them, Come up hither : and they ascended up to heaven in a cloud ; and their enemies beheld them." (Rev. xi. 12.) Now to apply this, as Mr. Elliott does, to the political establishment of Protestantism,—the heaven in question being regarded as the symbolical heaven of political greatness and influence,—is to minify and degrade it. How much more in accordance with the general tenor of this sublime book, to regard it as implying that Christ's faithful witnesses, as they pass successively from earth, are received to the realms of light and glory, while even among men their character is often vindicated, and their memory crowned with honour, through the signal interposition of God !

Now it is the attempt to trace in the Revelation a continuous and progressive development of the fortunes of the Church from the time of St. John, that has led, we conceive, to these interpretations ; though it is but fair to acknowledge that they are not essential to that scheme. But we pass on to the sounding of the seventh trumpet ; and to us it seems incontrovertible that the express words of the prophecy connect that event with the winding up of this world's history. The rainbow-crowned angel, swearing "by Him that liveth for ever and ever," affirmed that "in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as He hath declared to His servants the prophets" (Rev. x. 7), and when, at length, the seventh angel sounded, loud voices in heaven proclaimed the triumph of God and of His Messiah over every opposing power, even over the last great outbreak of evil upon earth, and the arrival of the time when the dead should be judged, and when retribution should be rendered to men according to their character and works. (Rev. xi. 15—19.)

Without adopting, therefore, in every particular, the expositions of Dr. Vaughan, or of Dr. Hengstenberg, whom he usually follows, and without rejecting *some* of the interpretations of Mr. Elliott, we embrace the leading principle of the former divines,—that we have in the Revelation distinct groups of visions, each of which brings us to the time of the end, while each presents some new feature of the history of the Church, of the enemies that should assail it, the sufferings and conflicts through which it should pass, and the triumphs with which it should at last be crowned. If this principle is

accepted as established, some progress is made towards the correct exposition of this book, though many points will still remain involved in doubt and obscurity.

We have already traced two of these groups of visions. The *third*, according to Drs. Hengstenberg and Vaughan, extends through the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth chapters. This section of prophecy is occupied chiefly with the *enemies* of Christ and His Church; and symbolises the diversified history of the Church, as in conflict with these enemies, during the whole period from the ascension of our Lord until His coming again in glory. The *fourth* group comprehends the vision of the seven angels with the *seven vials*, and is found in the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters. This vision, while conducting us to the grand issue, is specially designed, according to Dr. Vaughan, to shed light on some particulars in the discomfiture and overthrow of the three great enemies of Christ's kingdom described in the former section. "We enter to night," he says, in the opening of his twenty-eighth Lecture, "upon a new section of this Divine book. The last passage of the fourteenth chapter brought down the inspired disclosure to the very end of all things. After the vision of the harvest and the vintage, there can be no later transaction on the defiled and desecrated earth. The next revelation in order of time must be that of the *new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness*. But though this must be the sequence of events in order of chronology, there are parts of the picture still to be completed before we are prepared for the descent of the holy city, from heaven to earth, and the final establishment amongst men of the tabernacle of God. In particular, we have yet to learn in fuller detail the fate of the three enemies described in the last section. We have heard in the fourteenth chapter, in general terms, that their overthrow is destined and certain. But the particulars of the overthrow have not yet been disclosed." * The *fifth* group is contained in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth chapters. The prominent figure here is the harlot sitting upon the scarlet-coloured beast, and forming the mystic Babylon; and the section closes with her utter overthrow, and with our Lord's perfect victory over the combined powers of evil making their last and fiercest attack upon His cause and kingdom.

Many things in Dr. Vaughan's explanations of these groups invite remark; but we cannot here discuss them at length.

* Vol. ii. pp. 131, 132.

Following the guidance of Dr. Hengstenberg, he regards the wild beast from the sea—the sea being viewed, according to Rev. xvii. 15, as the symbol of multitudes of people—as representing *the world in its ungodly, anti-Christian power*, the world arrayed against the Church, both to persecute and to seduce it. The wild beast from the earth of Rev. xiii., afterwards identified with the false prophet, he regards as symbolising *the ungodly, anti-Christian wisdom of the world*, “that false philosophy, that *science falsely so called*, that speculation and sceptical opinion, that reason without humility and without God, which, with all its professions of elevation and of independence, has ever been the real ally of the world, and the bitterest enemy of revelation and of the Church. This it was which propped up a system of idolatry in which it had itself no vestige of faith. This it was which united with the coercive power of a heathen state in running down and making havoc of the new religion and the young Church of Christ.”* Thus the great enemies of Christ's cause, depicted under the third group, are the dragon or Satan,—the world in its anti-Christian power,—and the world in its ungodly wisdom.

With regard to the harlot sitting upon the scarlet-coloured beast, several intimations given in the course of the prophecy, more particularly in Rev. xvii. 9, 18, clearly point to *Rome* as the city intended: but while most evangelical expositors consider that Rome is here regarded as the seat of the Papacy, and that the true character of that fearful corruption of Christianity is prophetically indicated, Dr. Vaughan contends that the reference is, in the first instance, to Imperial Rome, which, in St. John's day, and for ages afterwards, was the great power that persecuted the Church of God. He admits, indeed, a *secondary* application to the Papacy; and he seeks to derive a lesson of warning to our own country from the judgments which were threatened against Rome.

“Was it not,” he asks, “as the temporary rider upon that beast which is the world, that Imperial Rome entered upon its crusade against the cause and against the people of Christ? Was it not its worldliness, its addiction to things of time, its absorption in the pleasures and luxuries of this life, its secular indifference, at last its effeminate sensuality, which in fact made Rome cruel, made it a persecutor, made it an enemy of God? Not for nothing is it here said that the merchant princes of the earth were the chief mourners at Rome's funeral. A country of mean pretension, of humble power,

of scanty trade, of feeble prowess, is in the same degree protected against the risks of becoming a Babylon: it is not there, it is not in such quarters, that we must look abroad in search of her antitype in this century. But if I see a nation great in arts and arms, spanning the world with its enterprise, and embracing all nations in its commerce, there I may begin to inquire, What are the relations of that country towards the Church of Christ? Is it interested in the cause of truth? Is it active in the propagation of the Gospel? Is it a nation *fearing God and working righteousness*? There, too, in that nation, I approach more nearly to the individual heart, and say, What is its relation to that world which is the beast? Are its *affections set on things above, and not on things on the earth*? Is that heart the abode of God's Spirit, or is it the hold of unclean and hateful things? As I hear, I tremble: tremble lest this steed and its rider be in that nation, in that heart, exemplified again; tremble lest, in the day of God's last judgment, which shall be not upon extinct nations, and not upon historical events, but upon individual living men, we should be told that we never obeyed the charge to *come forth out of Babylon*, but, having been *partakers of her sins*, must expect to receive also *of her plagues*."—Vol. ii. pp. 217, 218.

Into the discussion of this interpretation of the mystic Babylon we forbear to enter. It is well deserving of attention; but, while we accept the exposition that the *beast* represents the anti-Christian power of the world, many things in the prophetic imagery incline us to adhere to the generally received opinion of Protestant writers, that the *woman* expressly symbolises Papal Rome, considered as directing that power, and in various ways corrupting the truth of Christ, and seducing men into evil.

But we pass on to the visions recorded in the twentieth chapter; and here we must express our entire dissent from the interpretation of Dr. Vaughan. To this portion of the Revelation every devout reader turns with special interest, as bearing on the great questions affecting the millennium. The binding of Satan,—the reign with Christ for a thousand years of those who had suffered martyrdom for Him, and who had never succumbed to the great enemies of His kingdom,—and the remarkable statement respecting the first resurrection,—are certainly among the most interesting, as they are among the most difficult, parts of this mysterious book. Some interpret them of the events which will attend the second advent of the Lord Jesus, and found upon them, in connexion with other parts of Scripture, the theory, that our Lord will reign personally upon earth, fixing His glorious throne at Jerusalem, and there surrounded with the Church

of the first-born, who will accompany Him from heaven, and whose bodies will be raised from the dead, while the resurrection of the wicked dead is deferred until the period designated by the thousand years is expired. They conceive, further, that during this period there will be nations of mortal men, with the business of life going on very much as usual, in other parts of the world, who will be attracted to Jerusalem, and bring their glory and honour into it. The difficulties of this scheme appear to us to be insuperable; and, in particular, we cannot regard the symbolical vision which met the eye of the Apostle John, and the statement he appends to it, as teaching that the general resurrection will be cut into two distinct and distant parts,—the resurrection of the just taking place at the beginning of the period marked as that of a thousand years, and the resurrection of condemnation taking place at its close. We recall with reverence the explicit words of our Lord Himself, recorded by this evangelist, which seem to us to teach that the resurrection of the wicked will *immediately* follow that of the righteous:—"Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." (John v. 28, 29.) Others regard this symbolical imagery as pointing out the arrival of a period in which the power of evil shall be greatly restrained, until its last terrific outburst takes place, and in which the souls of the martyrs shall, as it were, revive in their successors, the living Church exhibiting the spirit of unreserved devotedness to Christ, and the cause for which His faithful witnesses suffered and bled being triumphant over all. But Dr. Vaughan takes a very different view. Comparing the statement respecting the *binding of Satan* with our Lord's expressions in Luke x. 18, John xii. 31, xvi. 8, 11, he conceives that it refers, not to a future period, when the power of evil will be far more strictly coerced than it now is, and when truth and righteousness shall generally prevail among men, but to the whole period intervening between our Lord's ascension, and the last great outbreak of evil against God's government and the Saviour's claims. He regards the phrase "a thousand years" as indicating not a strictly defined period, but rather "a period protracted, prolonged, but indefinite." "We should ill have entered," he says, "into the language or spirit of the Apocalypse, if we sought to tie down such a figure to a literal interpretation. If we have rightly understood the words now under consideration, the

thousand years of Satan's detention denote the whole space between the completion of the work of man's redemption by the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, and the arrival of that latest conflict, be it what it may, which will immediately herald the approach of His second advent in glory."* *The first resurrection and the reign of the saints with Christ*, Dr. Vaughan also regards as belonging to the period that now is, the period between our Lord's ascension and His second advent. In our Lord's glorious reign at the Father's right hand—

"The souls of His servants, as they successively pass into His presence, are associated and incorporated with Him. 'To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me in My throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with My Father in His throne.' The first resurrection is that awakening from the death of the body to the life of the soul; that transition from a world of shadows into a world of realities; that passing from a state in which *we see through a glass darkly* into a state in which we shall see *face to face*, which is the Christian's near future, even as the resurrection of the body, and its transformation into the likeness of *Christ's glorious body*, is the Christian's more remote but nobler and more satisfying prospect still. This is that resurrection of which the wicked partake not: *the rest of the dead*, those who had not borne the testimony of Jesus, but had received in their forehead and on their hand the mark of that beast which is the world, *the rest of the dead lived not*, in that sense of life which is alone the Gospel's and the Christian's sense: *till the thousand years are finished*, they exist only in that suffering of the lost soul which is separation from God, and therefore also from life and from hope; and when they are finally reunited to the resurrection body, it will be for them not a *body of glory*, but a body of shame, of anguish, of torment; a body suited to that future life which is called more properly the second death; a state of unrest, of remorse, of despair, of companionship with all that is evil, of final severance from every thing good or lovely or loving; a state of which well may it be written in the Book of God, '*Good were it for the man finally condemned to it, if he had never been born.*'"—Vol. ii. pp. 255, 256.

Now in this view of the prophetic vision we cannot concur. We believe, indeed, that the power of Satan was restrained and curtailed when our Lord, having completed His work of atonement, and risen from the dead, ascended to His heavenly throne; we believe, too, that the economy then introduced contained every provision for the overthrow of the Tempter's usurped dominion, while the very fact of our Lord's enthronement at the Father's right hand was the pledge that all His enemies should be made His footstool, and that Satan, the

* Vol. ii. pp. 252.

first and greatest Adversary, should stand at last subdued and confounded before Him : but we cannot regard the present state of the world, or its state since the Ascension, as at all corresponding to the symbolical representation, that Satan should be shut up in the abyss, and that abyss sealed over him, "that he should deceive the nations no more till the thousand years should be fulfilled." We think of the prevalence of idolatry,—of the cruel, obscene, polluting rites by which it is everywhere distinguished,—of the open ungodliness which defies the majesty, and contemns the government, of Jehovah,—of the subtle infidelity which, while professing to honour Christianity, deprives its declarations and warnings of their authority and their power to reach the conscience and the heart ; and as we survey this sad spectacle, we remember how the Holy Scriptures connect this state of things with the agency of *him* who is "the god of this world," while his hosts generally are spoken of as "the rulers of the darkness of this world, spirits of wickedness in high," or heavenly, "places." We cling to the sentiment, that this part of the Apocalypse points to a time yet future, when the power of the great Adversary shall be greatly restrained, and when truth and righteousness shall generally prevail.

A few words may be added on the character of these Lectures considered as pulpit-addresses. Dr. Vaughan usually selects as a text some striking passage from the section which he proposes to illustrate ; and, after a few introductory remarks, which are always appropriate and forcible, he gives a brief exposition of the entire section, traces out what he conceives to be its meaning and application, and then gathers up the lessons which the subject suggests. On these he often dwells at considerable length ; interweaving with the instruction which he seeks to convey the most earnest and thrilling appeals. It is refreshing to mark the fidelity and power with which he presses the truth on the consciences of his people. He speaks as one who has a vivid consciousness of the dangers of men, and of the varied conflicts of the Christian life, and who, at the same time, has a profound conviction of the certainty of the unseen things with which he has to deal. He speaks, too, as one who feels that his people are his charge,—that his interests are bound up with theirs,—and that their reception of the truth, and obedience to its requirements, are essential to his own happiness. In reading these volumes, we have again and again felt that, apart from the interest of the subject which they discuss, all ministers might read them with advantage, as showing

the manner in which the pastors of Christ's flock should appeal to the consciences of men, and grapple with the evils that threaten to seduce and ruin them. We shall select two passages in illustration. In the second Lecture, when enforcing our Lord's charge against the church at Ephesus, that, amidst much that was excellent, it had "left its first love," he says:—

"You observe that it is no answer to the charge here written, to say that you are still living in all Christian habits. You have noticed how very strongly this is expressed in the context. Labour for Christ, patience and submission, hatred of evil, and zeal for good, these things were all still true of that church which had yet left its first love. As in other things, so in religion, the force of habit is strong. A person who has once begun to pray and to read God's Word and to attend the Holy Communion, finds it almost easier to go on with these things than to give them up. To give them up is to attract notice; notice from Christian friends, notice from worldly neighbours. To give them up is to awaken conscience; to arouse every thing that is in us of conviction and of godly fear into an open condemnation of our act and of our state. To go on with Christian habits, even when Christian love has grown faint, is to avoid observation and to lull conscience; to satisfy a sense of duty, and to keep all things in train for the possibility of a return.

"Dare we say, my brethren, in how many hearts here open before God the text sounds as a true indictment? It is not in the ranks of the openly indifferent, not amongst known sinners, amongst the immoral or the profane, that we must seek them: rather will they be found amidst our regular worshippers, amidst our at least occasional communicants, amongst those whom we cannot but respect, for whom (so far as we know them) we cannot but be hopeful. Do not some of these look back sadly and sorrowfully, and perhaps with bitter self-reproach, upon a time in their lives more devoted than the present? A time when they were more alive to the love of Christ, and when, if their life was not more consistent, at least their heart was tenderer and more spiritual."—Vol. i. pp. 34, 35.

Our second extract is from the twenty-second Lecture. Dr. Vaughan, following Dr. Hengstenberg and Dean Alford, interprets the reaping of the "harvest" of the earth, in Rev. xiv., of the ingathering of the Lord's people, while he refers the "vintage" to the ultimate crushing of His enemies. And as he enforces the lessons which this last subject suggests, he says:—

"It was said by them of old time, *The world hath lost his youth, and the times begin to wax old.* Two thousand years ago was this felt by moralists and philosophers. How is it now? Does it not, indeed, seem to many of us, that the measure of the earth's evils, and the

measure of the earth's sins, must be by this time well-nigh full? *Whereunto shall it grow if it is to grow yet without limit?* If knowledge is to increase year by year, and each year with a more entire severance from the source and spring of truth; if the ingenuity of wickedness is to advance step by step with its audacity, and human skill unenlightened by Divine wisdom is all that can be set to cope with it in either; if luxury on this side and wretchedness on that must more and more stand apart and face each other, the one in cold disdain, the other in envious hostility; if God is to be more and more banished from His earth, and restricted with an ever-growing jealousy within the limits of an unreal, at least of a distant and an inactive, heaven; shall not these things to a Christian eye be signs rather of a hastening than of a procrastinated end? Shall we not see in them all so many indications of the appearance of the white cloud and of the approach of Him that sits thereon? Shall we not hear in every sound the voice of the angel crying unto his fellow, *Thrust in thy sharp sickle, and gather the clusters of the vine of the earth; for her grapes are fully ripe?*

"God grant that it be not needful in this congregation to speak of the individual ripening for the vintage of wrath and judgment! Yet there is such a process: and it is carried on side by side with the individual ripening for the harvest. There is such a thing as a man being matured for punishment, as well as a man being matured for glory. . . . There is an obstinate hardening of the heart against conviction; there is a resolute returning again and again to an evil way; there is a hearing with sealed ear and a seeing with closed eye; there is a refusal of mercy, and there is a daring of judgment; there is an increasing neglect of the means of grace, and a growing skill in using the means of grace without using them; there is a deepening darkness upon the understanding, and a thickening film upon the conscience, and a progressive insensibility to remonstrance, and (the words must be spoken) a gathering dislike, and at least hostility, towards God Himself; which, like the opposite symptoms of grace in the soul of the Christian, indicate the approach of an individual end, and define to the eye of the beholder the nature of that end which is hastening on. It is to the sickle of the vintage that these signs point, even as the others pointed to the sickle of the harvest. Let us look earnestly each one of us into the secrets of these veiled and cloaked hearts of ours, as they lie open this night before the eye of our Judge! As yet, through His grace, the saddest, the most fatal sign may be reversed, and the vintage of wrath changed for any one of us into the harvest of glory. But *the time is short*. Death waits not for our tarrying; and dead souls have been chained ere now in living bodies. Let the dead, while yet there is time, hear in their living graves that voice of the Son of God, which whosoever hears shall live. So shall we hear that voice with joy and not with grief, when it sounds at the last day through the sepulchres of many generations, and summons all who hear to resurrection and judgment."—Vol. ii. pp. 127—129.

Such appeals as these are at all times important and necessary; and never more so than in the present day. They are pitched to the true key-note. It is not too much to expect that the mind of the Christian minister should be surrendered to the influence of the great realities which he has to announce, and should be intent on the vital and enduring interests of those whom he addresses. But if this is the case, he cannot but plead with them with profound earnestness and tender solicitude. Nothing is more unnatural, nothing more revolting, than the attempt simply to please and attract by means of the great truths of Christianity, without any endeavour to rouse the conscience or engage the heart. In the exercises of the pulpit there may well be a rich unfolding of truth, and an illustration of that truth by the analogies of nature and the facts of history; but nothing can compensate for the absence of those *appeals* in which heart speaks to heart, and by which the Christian pastor may humbly hope to win the souls of men.

ART. III.—*The Fatherhood of God ; being the First Course of the Cunningham Lectures delivered before the New College, Edinburgh, in March, 1864.* By ROBERT S. CANDLISH, D.D. Edinburgh : A. & C. Black. 1865.

THE recently-founded Cunningham Lectureship is designed, and, we hope, destined to supply a desideratum in the theological literature of Scotland. Rich as North Britain is in a portable, *popular* divinity, its comparative poverty in high-class theological standards is admitted with regret by those who have done most to meet the deficiency. In this noblest field of mental toil, Scotland not only owns her vast inferiority to England, but deplores her still more marked inferiority to herself in almost every other department of literature. Her pre-eminence in fiction, history, biography, criticism, mechanics, mathematics, mental philosophy ; her high place in poetry, political economy, engineering, and natural science ; renders still more conspicuous her low status in divinity. Whilst her secular horizon is all ablaze with the most brilliant constellations, her theological firmament is like the southern celestial hemisphere, picturesque, indeed, with nebulous and stellar masses, and sprinkled with a mildly radiant star-dust, but with few great lights, until Chalmers arose, with his attendant luminaries, like the Southern Cross, the guiding stars of public opinion, and the bright indicators of the time. The scantiness of the Scottish sacred classics could not be attributed to any lack of ability or of aptitude in the Scottish intellect. Might it not be owing, in a great measure, to the absence of those external facilities and inducements which wealthier England has at her command ? So, at least, the Free Church leaders think. Mr. Fairbairn, to whose exertions the present endowment is mainly due, states this very significantly and shrewdly. “Rich England and its wealthy church may keep a theological literature of a high class. But there is not water enough in Scotland to float vessels of so large a draught.” This pecuniary *low water* is, doubtless, also the real cause of the want of the required volume in another stream which is very helpful in the launching of *first-rate* theology. Scotland is, at least, as far behind in high-class scholarship as in high-class divinity. Most of the great English theologians have had at command not only libraries and leisure, but also a vast and accurate

erudition. Assuredly, the fact that our greatest divines and our greatest statesmen have been sound scholars tends to prove that deep classical learning is not to be despised in training for eminent service, whether in the Church or State. To revert to Dr. Johnson's rude gastronomic comparison, it requires more than "a mouthful" of learning to produce such a work as Pearson's on the Creed.

The Cunningham Lectureship (so called in honour of the late Professor of Divinity) was founded by Dr. Webster, with the view of "advancing the theological literature of Scotland." Its objects are similar to those contemplated by "the Boyle, Warburtonian, Bampton, or Hulsean lectures of the Church of England, or the more recent series called "The Congregational Lectures."* In the selection of lecturers, the trustees are not positively restricted to ministers or professors of the Free Church. They "may occasionally appoint a minister or professor from other denominations." "The lecturer shall be at liberty to choose his own subject, within the range of apologetical, doctrinal, controversial, exegetical, pastoral, or historical theology, including what bears on missions, home and foreign, subject to the consent of the council."†

Very high anticipations are formed of the advantages to be derived by Scotland from this institution. These are glowingly described by Mr. Fairbairn: "Throughout every future generation it would have the effect of collecting and preserving every drop of pure and profound thought that might spring up in any part of the Church, and which would otherwise run to waste, and would concentrate all such supplies into one deep and ever-widening stream of divine truth, which, through all coming time, would contribute to refresh and make glad the city of our God." It was natural that the first choice of the council should fall upon Dr. Candlish. His years and services, his eminence as a speaker and writer, entitled him to that distinction. It was known, indeed, that he was speculative, fond of new and startling expositions and doctrinal statements, endowed with a certain self-beguiling ingenuity in the defence of theories which require very great ingenuity to make them plausible, or to procure them notice. Still, he was able; his orthodoxy could not be challenged; and though always a better breaker than builder, his faults even in the latter capacity were chiefly those of a sanguine, self-reliant architect, whose work is more

* Letter to Dr. Candlish, Feb. 1853.

† Declaration of Trust.

picturesque than symmetrical, and who encumbers with ornamentation and out-building an otherwise serviceable and sightly structure. What was proposed, as one object of the lectureship—"to harmonize originality with conservatism,"—Dr. Candlish had, in his own writings, to a fair extent, secured. His choice of subject, too, was as auspicious as the choice of a lecturer. The man who should give a clear, full, and guarded statement of the Scripture doctrine of "The Fatherhood of God," defending it from the gross exaggerations, rude mutilations, and girlish sentimentalities of rationalism, from the theology of novels and of newspapers, from popular misconception, from antinomian effrontery, and from ritualistic degradation, would deserve well of the Church and of the age. Such service was expected from Dr. Candlish. What, then, was the surprise of Scotland, what the mortification of the best friends of the enterprise, when they found that this champion of orthodoxy had become the unwitting assailant of the first article of the Christian Creed, in becoming the special pleader against the most glorious birthright of our nature! We say the *unwitting* assailant, because the astute lecturer is very solicitous to show that his novel hypothesis is not hopelessly irreconcilable with the teaching of the Church from the beginning. He cannot but see that his line of argument is sharply divergent from that of all expositors of the Catholic doctrine, and from the universal tenor of evangelical exhortation and appeal; but he maintains that the novelty is not in principle, only in the *putting*. Our readers will judge of the felicity of the *putting*, when we state what are the positions which Dr. Candlish assumes, and in what way he defends them.

The first article of the Christian Creed is, "I believe in God the *Father Almighty*." The history of man's origination is in these words: "God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him. The Lord God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Dr. Candlish denies that God is the Father of the human race. He says (p. 28), "Let it be *settled* as a *great fundamental truth* that the relation of fatherhood in God cannot have its rise in creation." How does he proceed to prove this? His first step is to refuse any definition of his leading term, *fatherhood*. He says, "I am not called upon, at least in the first instance, to define exactly, or to describe particularly, the relation now in question. It is rather incumbent on those who assert it." This prerogative of declining definition he inexorably exerts throughout the whole

course of lectures; and even in his preface, written more than a year after, he still challenges his exemption. He will not allow any one to distract him for a definition. He writes, "I have not felt myself bound to attempt any exact or formal definition of the sonship" (p. 9). The inconvenience and unfairness of this is obvious and manifold. 1. To those whom he assumes to be his opponents: he charges them with being "inclined to deal in somewhat vague generalities" (p. 10), and with "their dislike of definition" (p. 107), and then, in effect, he says, "The duty of defining the terms I employ belongs to those from whom I differ; I shall not define; I have no objection to explain myself so far as this, that whatever they may mean by the Fatherhood of God (which, through their dislike of definition, I cannot clearly make out) I do not mean; whatever definition they frame, I reject in advance." He upbraids them with a fault and a weakness in the very act of committing the selfsame fault, and betraying the selfsame weakness. 2. It is very disconcerting, not to say discourteous, to those whom he justly regards as constituting on such questions the highest appellate court, "intelligent and candid students of theology and the Word of God." If he felt that a frank and unmistakeable avowal of his meaning would be an impolitic concession to those votaries of vagueness whom he guessed to hold views at variance with his own, surely his dogged denial of answer to the very first question which "intelligent and candid" students must necessarily ask—"What do you regard as essential to Fatherhood?"—amounts to little less than contempt of court, the very court to which he brought his cause. And this eccentricity on the part of the appellant is irremediably confusing; so much so as, in the case of any one less entitled to a deferential hearing out, to justify a summary dismissal. For example, Dr. Candlish is very anxious to show that his views are not opposed to those of sound divines, such as Pearson, Barrow, and Treffry. He is obliged to admit that they assert what he denies; that is, the Fatherhood of God to man, as a fundamental principle both of natural and revealed religion; *but then*, he saves himself by saying, "What they mean by Fatherhood is not just what I mean." You answer, "It is impossible to mistake what they mean by it, Doctor; but what do you mean?" The resolute reply is, "*I am not called upon to define.*" It is clear that Dr. Candlish is loudly "called upon" to define. It is also as clear that he is not prepared to do so. Whether as a professor or a polemic, the first thing he was called upon to do was to state his subject,

which he could not do without defining that term on which the whole decision of the question depends.

Right answers to these two questions are all that is necessary to the settlement of the case. 1. What is *essential* to the idea of Fatherhood? 2. Does the original relation of God to man include all that is essential to that idea? The answer to the first question is this: *The origination of an intelligent being by a previously existing intelligent being, involving the communication from the originator to the originated of a life like his own, is all that is essential to the idea of Fatherhood.* The answer to the second question is, *Yes*; if revelation be at all reliable. After a reconsideration of the case and the lapse of a twelvemonth, Dr. Candlish admits* that this "original relation" is "very nearly akin to fatherly and filial fellowship." But he adds, "I refuse to call it sonship." Happily for the human race, *God does not refuse to call it sonship.* And we believe that there are very few of our widely alienated species who will join Dr. Candlish in his refusal.

Nor is the lecturer fairer or more fortunate in his next step. He starts with the admission that the inquiry is "one that ought to be conducted on the principle of a pure and simple appeal to Scripture." He forthwith proceeds "to look at it for a little in the light of natural religion." He describes "natural religion" as "the elements, whether intuitional or experimental, out of which the system of rational Theism must be constructed." Where does he search for those elements? Not where the great expositors of the creed, such as Pearson and Barrow, have sought them—in the writings of the noblest heathen thinkers, where alone they can be safely sought for, since it is impossible for us to tone down the blaze of revelation, and enshroud ourselves in the visible darkness of unaided reason. To any one who has read the Bible, *natural religion* is defunct. Its oracles cannot be evoked from a Christianised consciousness, but must be recognised, if anywhere, in the utterances of the mighty unevangelised dead. But the lecturer does not allow them to say what little they know. He performs a feat of intellectual ventriloquism, by making his own voice seem to come from the party he interrogates. The interlocutions between Dr. Candlish and natural religion† are, in fact, a soliloquy from beginning to end. He professes to take down the evidence of the first witness he produces, puts "*leading questions*," shaped so as to elicit the answers he desires, and then does

* Preface, p. ii.

† Sect. 1.

not allow the witness to speak for himself, but frames replies just to suit the conclusion he is anxious to establish. The acute lecturer practises a delusion on himself, when he gives the name of natural religion to a purely personal speculation. True, in his third lecture he incidentally alludes to Saint Paul's appeal, on this doctrine, to the sublime poetry of the Greeks: "As certain also of your own poets have said, 'For we are also His offspring.'" He frankly admits that "this pregnant saying, though originally a merely human and heathen utterance, St. Paul, by quoting it, of course, adopts and engrosses as his own." "An application of the maxim that like produces like." But still he maintains it is only a figurative expression. Yet every one will see that if the relationship on which St. Paul bases his argument be figurative, then the whole argument is fallacious, such as, even apart from inspiration, the scholar of Gamaliel would hardly address to the "men of Athens." The Apostle reasons *from* the spirituality of man to the spirituality of God. "*For we are His offspring.*" If there were no original communication of nature from God to man, such as constitutes us "*His offspring,*" then this "wise master-builder" endeavoured to found a real practical conclusion on merely figurative premises.

Another egregious unfairness of the first lecture is, that having started with the admission that the question must be settled by "a pure and simple appeal to Scripture," it prefaces its appeal to Scripture by an attempt to prove that, if Scripture were to assert the Fatherhood of God to man as an original relationship, it would assert what is absolutely impossible and absurd. Not content with this, he commences his appeal to Scripture by an elaborate endeavour, stretching through the second lecture, to forestall its direct decision, by making out that the God-man could not be at the same time the Divine Son of God and a human son of God. As if there were any greater mystery in this than that which is involved in His being both Divine and human, which Dr. Candlish devoutly believes. There is surely no greater mystery in the conjunction of a twofold sonship in the same person, than in the conjunction of human infirmities and Divine perfections. The lecturer contends that this *divides* the sonship. On the contrary, it unites the one with the other. A double relationship is not a divided relationship.

When, at last, in the third lecture, we are indulged with something like a direct biblical investigation, we have to complain, first of an inadvertence, and then of an ingenuity

equally unfavourable to the fair unfolding of the truth. In professing to bring before us all the evidence of the Old Testament on the original relation of man to God, he omits the passage which is the key to all the rest; "God created man in His own image," &c. "The Lord God breathed," &c. He omits, amongst others, a passage of special interest and importance, as indicating, if we may so speak, the popular Jewish theology on this question, the ideas of the relation of God to man, and of the character of the divine administration which the Hebrew mind had gathered from the Mosaic records and institutions. We refer to the remarkable appeal of the woman of Tekoa to David, on behalf of Absalom, his son. The whole force of that powerful argument is derived from the correspondence of the relation of the King of Israel to his guilty son with the relationship of God to man, and to the fact that the whole spirit of God's government of mortals is that of sovereign severity, tempered by the yearning compassion of a father's heart. "*For we must needs die—neither does God respect any person, yet doth He devise means that His banished be not expelled from Him.*" But this combination of sovereignty and Fatherhood in God, of "subjectship" and sonship in us, which is the only key to the mysteries of God's government of man—is just what Dr. Candlish declares to be impossible, excepting through the mystery of the incarnation, whereby believers share the *Divine* sonship of Christ, as the counterpart and compensation for Christ sharing the human "subjectship" of believers. As this is the key-stone of the doctor's system, it is necessary to inspect it for a moment. It requires, indeed, but a moment's reflection to see that this assumed incompatibility of "subjectship" and sonship is at variance with the plainest facts of history and the clearest teachings of God's Word. Wherever there has been a royal family, the two relations have been combined in the same persons. As to the testimony of inspiration, it is enough to quote one passage, "*If ye call on the Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man's work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear.*"* This is the counterpart to the plea of the woman of Tekoa. The lecturer strives to show the incompatibility of the two relations from the fact that a Jewish parent was not required to execute his own incorrigible son, but to hand him over to the magistrates. He forgets that the execution took place, none the less, at the father's instance, on his appeal, evidence, and

* 1 Pet. i. 17.

demand. An arrangement analogous to this may be seen in the judicial economy of God. "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, because He is the Son of man;" "He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained." But that even amongst the Hebrews the paternal and judicial relation could not always be separated is seen in the case of Eli, whose fatal fault was not that he sustained the double relationship of father and of judge, but that he sacrificed the obligations of the one to the sensibilities of the other.

We cannot but demur also to the lecturer's treatment of those passages of the Old Testament to which he has adverted. For example, he writes, "God's treatment of Adam in the garden is palpably irreconcilable with the idea of anything like the paternal and filial relation subsisting between them." So far is this from being a just representation of the facts, that it is impossible to conceive of a higher manifestation of a holy, benign, and perfect Fatherhood than that which is given in "God's treatment of Adam in the garden." What are the features of a perfect Fatherhood? Are they not lavish indulgence, firm authority, strict discipline, close oversight, searching reproof, severity, tenderness, relenting? All these are presented in the strongest light. From the gift of a constitution "framed in the very prodigality of heaven," and the sumptuous donation of Eden and of Eve, and the grant of princely regency over a happy world, to the guarantee of preservation and redemption, we see throughout the consummate idea of a perfect Fatherhood combined with a perfect sovereignty. It is not till towards the close of his last lecture that the secret objection to admit all these overwhelming evidences of God's Fatherhood is allowed to transpire. He there states that "the peculiar benefit of sonship, its great radical, distinctive, characteristic property," is this, "It puts an end conclusively to probation." This, then, is the nearest approach to a definition of sonship which the book contains. Relieved of its superabundant emphasis, it amounts to this, *sonship is that which puts an end to probation*. At this rate, Dr. Candlish will not only revolutionise theology, but will confound all human terms, and all human ideas. We do not wonder at his reluctance to frame a definition of Fatherhood to correspond with his notion of sonship. The last lecture explains the whole matter. Dr. Candlish wishes to reduce the great foundation doctrine of the Fatherhood of God into a buttress to uphold the Calvinistic tenet of final perseverance.

He says, "I still desiderate in it the element or condition of absolute inviolability." In evidence of the reasonableness of this desideratum, he quotes, in his subsequently written preface, the argument of "Satan, in Milton"—

"The Son of God, I also am, or was,
And if I was, I am; relation stands."

It has long been proverbial that "the devil can quote Scripture for a purpose;" he cannot fairly complain, then, that theoretical theology should in its extremity quote him in turn. The lecturer says the devil "is logically right." If so, then, the lecturer "is logically right" also. But the latter has made the following admission: "A son's standing in his earthly parents' house is not absolutely and inviolably secure. He may go out, or he may be thrust out—right may be forfeited or renounced—that, too, even irrecoverably." Yet he "*was*" a son, and, "*if*" he "*was*," he might use Satan's argument, and be as "logically right" as was Satan himself in framing that ingenious *petitio principii*, of which the logic is on a par with the theology. At all events, whatever comes of the dogma, the argument is as characteristic a piece of sophistry as poetic genius could put into the tempter's mouth. Satan's syllogism would be just as appropriate to a lawfully divorced wife. Of course, the historical fact of the original relation cannot be annihilated, but of what avail is that when "the right" is "forfeited or renounced, and that, too, irrevocably?" It was small solace to the rich man in hell to be addressed by Abraham as "son," and this relation was not regarded on either side as an inalienable claim to a place in Abraham's bosom.

In like manner, the penitent appeal to the Fatherhood of God in Isaiah lxiii. 16, lxiv. 8, is disposed of by the lecturer as addressed only to a figurative paternity, having for its object simply "Israel as a spiritual or ideal person." But the passage itself is a sufficient refutation, inasmuch as its point and pathos are derived from the recognition of God's Fatherhood as a far deeper and *earlier* relation than that to Israel or Abraham—a relation in which the contrite heart might seek refuge, even whilst bewailing the forfeiture of all claim as "children of the covenant" which God made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. "Where is the sounding of Thy bowels, and of Thy mercies toward me? Are they restrained? Doubtless Thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not: Thou, O Lord, art *our*

Father, our Redeemer. *Thy name* is from everlasting. But now, O Lord, Thou art our Father—we all are the work of Thy hand."

Nor is the lecturer more successful in his endeavour to dispose of our Lord's own testimony to the Fatherhood of God. Thus, he makes "the matchless parable of the Prodigal Son," like "the legs of the lame, not equal."* He makes this to be the moral of the parable, as an answer to the reproach of the Pharisees, "This man receiveth sinners;" "You regard them as outcasts; He *would have them to be sons.*" Certainly the insertion of these auxiliaries, "would have to be," wherever the prodigal speaks, or the Father speaks, or the elder brother speaks, is absolutely necessary to work the parable round to the lecturer's theory of the Fatherhood of God. He thinks, indeed, that these suppressed subjunctives contain "the point of the parable." We should be sorry to inflict on Dr. Candlish the penance of reading the parable in public with these qualifying expletives always attached to the words, "Father," "Son," and "Brother."

One principal point, on which the able lecturer has confused himself, is, that the reality of the relationship depends upon the *mode* of its origination. He complains that in "the Shorter Catechism and other documents" no information whatever is given, nor is any opinion expressed, as to "*how* the relationship is constituted." An unquotable passage in Lecture V., p. 233, proves that he himself would have done well to imitate that reverential self-diffidence in giving "information" or "opinion" as to the "*how*" of spiritual operation. We do not remember to have met elsewhere with such an instance of prying into spiritual processes, and pressing human analogies beyond warrant of Scripture—such an attempt, in fact, to give an answer to the question of Nicodemus, which our Lord repressed, "*How can these things be?*"

We need not say, that, much as we regret the line which the lecturer has chosen, and devoutly as we disallow his interpretations, we still cherish a high appreciation of his character and services. Indeed, it would seem that some men are blessed with an exemption from the effect of deleterious doctrines, analogous to apostolic immunity from the power of poisons, "They shall take up serpents, and if they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them." We quite agree with him "that the doctrine of the Fatherhood has been little understood, and much abused in recent days;"

* Prov. xxvi. 7.

and on that very account we the more regret that he has endeavoured to exclude from the pale of orthodoxy a vast and most precious region of theology, and thus abandons it to the downy thistles of scepticism, and the gaudy weeds of sentimentalism. The truth is that the lecturer's *fundamental* mistake is identical with that of the romancing teachers of the day, viz. that Fatherhood and sovereignty, "sonship and subjectship," are incompatible, and, as a practical deduction, that *sonship shuts out probation*. Both are equally at variance with the passage we have already quoted, "If ye call on the Father, who *without respect of persons judgeth* according to *every man's work*, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear." The conclusions of those writers, repugnance to whose views has produced in the lecturer such a violent eccentricity of recoil, do not flow logically and legitimately from the Scripture statements which he has either ignored or explained away. It does not follow that because Scripture speaks of unconverted men as having lost a life which *belongs* to human nature, and as themselves "*lost*" and "*dead*," "*being alienated from the life of God*"; because it represents this relationship as that which gives the crimson hue to the guilt of the unconverted, "I have nourished and brought up *children*, and they have rebelled against Me;" because it represents true repentance to be the practical recollection of that relationship; because the first utterance of true repentance, is "*Father, I have sinned*;" because the work of Christ and of the Spirit is throughout represented as *restoration* and elevation;—it does not follow from all this, that the doting Eli is the pattern of all true Fatherhood; that God is bound to abdicate the throne of the universe in order that Satan and all who side with him may have their way; that because the rebel refuses to be reconciled and made like God, therefore God must become "*altogether such an one as*" himself; that God must permit the universe to be a lawless household at the mercy of incorrigible hatred and impurity. The whole difficulty of the question resides in that *one fact* which Dr. Candlish admits—the freedom of the human will. Happily, Christendom is not reduced to the alternative of yielding any great Catholic doctrine either to theological novelists or logical system-smiths. The Church of Christ will yet confess, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ—who sitteth at the right hand of the Father—from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

ART. IV.—*Life and Times of Sir Joshua Reynolds.* By C. LESLIE, Esq. and TOM TAYLOR, Esq. 1865.

"EVERYTHING turned out fortunately for Sir Joshua, from the moment of his birth to the hour I saw him laid in the earth. Never was a funeral of ceremony attended with so much sincere concern by all sorts of people. The day was favourable—the order not broken or interrupted in the smallest degree. Your uncle, who was back in the procession, was struck motionless at his entering the great west door. The body was just then entering the choir, and the organ began to open, and the long black train before him produced an astonishing effect on his sensibility, and, considering how dear to him the object of that melancholy pomp had been, everything, I think, was just as our deceased friend would, if living, have wished it to be; for he was, as you know, not altogether indifferent to this kind of observance."

No; for though "the sufficiency of Christian immortality frustrates all earthly glory, and the quality of either state after death makes a folly of posthumous memory,—yet man is a noble animal, splendid in ashes, and pompous in the grave; solemnizing natiivities and deaths with equal lustre, nor omitting ceremonies of bravery even in the infamy of his nature."

Two mighty pens—the one in the hand of Edmund Burke, the other in that of Sir Thomas Browne—here supply a solemn and splendid image, and a profound and most eloquent reflection. Both the image and the reflection naturally awaken a strong curiosity to know the whole story of what we may name *The Fortunate Life*, ended and crowned by those dark honours of the sepulchre which he who received them did not hold to be "supervacuuous," in this respect not resembling Horace, between whose character and his there were not a few other points of similarity.

This remarkable career was not without record previous to the publication of these volumes. Malone, Northcote, Allan Cunningham, each have contributed to its illustration; but it has not, till now, obtained a fair and full expression. Malone's memoir was slight; Northcote's "pottering" and illiterate; Allan Cunningham's—in the estimation of Leslie—was malicious and untrue. Nevertheless, Allan Cunningham's "*Lives of the British Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*," is an

entertaining book, giving a lively, and, on the whole, a truthful impression of the men whom he delineates. He was a poet, and had strong and glowing sympathy with the various forms of art. He lived among artists, being for a quarter of a century foreman to Sir Francis Chantrey, to whom he gave many a poetic hint. It was he who suggested the lovely idea of the snowdrop in the hand of the sleeping child in Lichfield Cathedral. He met constantly with men who knew Reynolds. He could have, so far as we know, no special reason for traducing his character. What he asserts is asserted deliberately, and in his short memoir of Reynolds there is a note to the effect that his damaging remarks were made after careful inquiry. It is true that he does not give his authorities. The impression he leaves on the reader's mind is a mixed one. Reynolds is placed before us as a man of high genius and determined purpose; shrewd, philosophic, equable in temper, courtly in manners, making and keeping a large circle of friends among the best classes of his countrymen for rank, learning and ability, among them much beloved, but debarred of court favour by his independence—all which agrees with the record we are about to follow; but he is exhibited as having another and less pleasing side to his character, most easily perceived by his dependants and subordinates, some of whom reported him to be exacting, penurious, and mean. People "spoke of him," says Allan Cunningham, "as they found him." No explicit contradiction or disproof of Cunningham's statements is given by Leslie. The reader is left to infer from the evidence before him of the high excellence of the character of Reynolds—its inconsistency with the charges brought against him. It is not in "The British Painters," however, that we find the following quotation from Northcote's conversations; but in Leslie's now published memoir. "You describe him," said Northcote, "as I remember Baretti once did Sir Joshua at his own table, saying to him, 'You are extravagant and mean, generous and selfish, envious and candid, proud and humble, a genius and a mere ordinary mortal at the same time.' I may not remember his exact words, but that was their effect. *The fact was, that Sir Joshua was a mixed character, like the rest of the world in that respect; but he knew his own failings, and was on his guard to keep them back as much as possible, though the defects would break out sometimes.*" Would not Thackeray have taken a careful note of that?

The volumes before us contain what is likely to be a final and sufficient biography of a man who stands out in the front

rank of the history of the last century, and who is a conspicuous figure in the Johnsonian circle. All available documents of importance have been gathered and arranged. The pocket-books of the painter have been placed at the disposal of the writers, together with some hitherto unpublished letters and papers, and there is no remaining rumour of untouched stores of information. Leslie's pen has a quiet and unaffected distinctness which seldom becomes smart or glowing, although, where his knowledge as a painter and observer of aspect and manners is brought into play, we are made to feel its subtle charm.

Mr. Taylor has taken up the narrative, left in a very unfinished state at the death of Leslie, and by a process of reticulation and addition has completed and put it together in his "own way." The key to his structural arrangement is found in a passage of his second volume, where he confesses his surprise on discovering the *political* complexion of Reynolds' career. This was a fortunate discovery in more ways than one, for it opens out a mass of material in the shape of historical accompaniments, lying within his own power to execute with spirit, and at the same time wonderfully helps to give importance to the work which, with much steady, zealous, faithful labour, he has completed in two good-sized volumes; probably on the whole more interesting to the general reader than if Leslie had lived to complete them himself. Leslie was, as we all know, an eminent master in the British School, and lived a placid life in the pursuit of his favourite art. We know—although his present coadjutor Mr. Taylor has published what professes to be his "Autobiography"—far too little about him as a man. An autobiography that refers as seldom as possible to the author and his doings is not the beau-ideal of an autobiography, and this is too much the case with Leslie's. In some gleanings of recollection in the introduction, we learn that he did not choose much to visit with any one who did not care about painting, or did not possess good specimens; as might therefore be expected, those portions of the memoir which were prepared by him are largely professional in material and tone. We are able to trace with great distinctness the double authorship; Mr. Taylor—he hardly needed to have done it—has marked off by square brackets those portions of the work supplied by himself. The alternations of tone are noticeable and pleasant. Leslie, a meek and aged man, plays an air upon his sweet and low-toned German flute, now tolerably long, now shorter. But his younger, heartier, more hirsute companion strikes in

suddenly with his *cornet-à-pistons*, wetting his lips and pouring shrill strains from his instrument, while the timid, apologetic German flute fills up the pauses. The performers are admirable friends. The stronger man does not try to outblow or override the venerable companion over whom he holds the office of protector, and he allows him a good share of the pence and praise. The flute dwells doatingly on studio anecdotes, picture criticisms, mild recollections and rectifications, culled from Northcote and other sources. The strain is taken up more briskly by the cornet, and the scene shifts to the theatre, the Parliament, the high seas, the club, the gaming house, the literary coterie, the battle-field, the current scandal, or riot, or duel. When December comes round, year by year, and the deaf president delivers his indistinct, and, as we are here taught to believe, his illogical "discourse," then the narrator becomes the critic; epitomises and analyses the lecture with independence and good sense, and bows out the year with the list of sitters in the studio of Leicester Square. Mr. Taylor has some good preliminary qualifications for work of this sort. He has studied painting closely as a critic, and to some extent practically as a painter. He spent some time entirely among the *ateliers* of Paris, a student himself. He is a poet. He is a dramatist. He is a scholar, and a man of great general accomplishments. He is both firm and modest in tone, and cautious in statement. Such of his general picture criticism as we are acquainted with is valuable for its thoughtful and conscientious *fairness* and lenity. He has a power of wide appreciation—seldom rises to enthusiasm—does not vituperate, and does not blunder, and writes with a painstaking and quiet vivacity which lights up the page agreeably to the end of the work, leaving finally on the minds of his readers a very full and fair impression of the life and times of his subject.

The lists of sitters, given from the pocket-books, will have great value as a permanent and public record to which owners of pictures by Sir Joshua can appeal for verification, and by which students of art may trace the progress of Reynolds' improvement, from the days when he painted the funny little old children with their dogs and cats, and lapelled waistcoats, and knee-breeches, and cocked hats—his own life and fire struggling with the dullness of the Hudson school—to the days when he triumphantly swept the dark clouds round the head of the sublime portrait of Mrs. Siddons, as the Tragic Muse.

Following the flute and cornet, then, as the shipwrecked

mariners followed the "airy music and flying noises in the Enchanted Isle" of Prospero, let us trace out some of the lines of life in this pleasant biography.

July 16, 1723, was the birthday of Joshua Reynolds. His father was a clergyman. We have prints of the face of the elder Reynolds from a picture painted by his son; and Leslie, who seems to have been deeply touched by the fact, notices that the costume in that portrait was afterwards adopted in the charming picture of Oliver Goldsmith, whom Reynolds loved: the same flowing philosophic robe that suggested the garden and the porch, the bared neck, the loose, turned-down collar,—the face in the two pictures being also seen at the same angle. The features of the father bear no trace of resemblance to those of the son. He has a handsomer face, but it has not the blunt, half-surly expression of the countenance we know so well as "Sir Joshua."

Joshua was not a "marvellous boy." His father thought him an idle one, as we shall presently see. He attended his father's school, and there laid the foundation of such education as he ever had. How deep that foundation was, we cannot very exactly judge. We hear nothing of Greek, and not a great deal of Latin. He read Ovid more or less in the original, and in after years, when he had lost the Latin epitaph written by Dr. Johnson on Goldsmith, the Doctor thought it possible that Reynolds might recalc and re-write it from memory—"Nil actum reputans dum quid superesset agendum," he writes in 1790 to Sheridan; and with this scanty amount of material the evidence on that head closes. A good painter of the Reynolds' organization is not the man to become a deep scholar. But he drew in school, if he did not study classics. On one of these school-drawings there is found written by the pater-magister—"Done by Joshua out of pure idleness." At a very early age "the Jesuit's Perspective" fell into his hands, and he studied it with such success that he was able to draw a correct representation of the colonnade beneath the school-house. His first attempt in oil colours was made with a ship-painter's tools and colours in a boat-house, in company with a certain Dick Edgecumbe, of whom we hear more in the course of the narrative.

Jonathan Richardson was born in 1665, and died in 1745. He was a portrait painter, though not of the highest class. But he is best remembered by "An Essay on the whole Art of Criticism as it relates to Painting," and "An Argument in behalf of the Science of a Connoisseur." One or both of these works—which Mr. Wornum says ought to be in every art

library—young Reynolds read, and they, he was wont to say, "made him a painter." We cannot accept Reynolds' definition of art-genius as being "great general powers accidentally determined in a particular direction," but such glowing and simple enthusiasm as breathes in the words of Richardson were enough to raise the latent spark of genius into a flame. Thenceforth his bias was made manifest, and the "particular direction" chosen. His father had some views of making him a physician; but seeing his strong bent for painting, he offered no resistance, and with entire sympathy did what he could to forward his tastes and interests. The pupil and son-in-law of Richardson, Hudson, one of the Sir Godfrey school of painters, was then at the head of the British likeness takers, prosperous and popular, and Joshua was, at the age of seventeen, apprenticed to him. The required fee was £120. Of this one-half was borrowed from his sister, Mrs. Palmer. Hudson's pictures were dull, heavy, and formal. The interest of the work was distributed with great impartiality over the cocked hat, the ruffles, the broad-sleeved coat, the waistcoat, and the face. While standing *before* pictures of that school the face cannot well be overlooked, but when away from them the face cannot easily be recalled to memory. We endeavour to remember it, but the broad-sleeved coat, the waistcoat, the ruffles, and the cocked hat, that wearisome black triangle usually being carried under the arm, are too much for us. We have to meditate on "the fitness of things" before we are very sure that there *was* a face. And yet, strange to say, the face was not so badly painted. While the conception and relations of such pictures are depressing, the execution is often good. It is a long road which the uneducated young artist has to pass before he can mix oil-colours, and set eye, nose, lip, in its place as well as Hudson did; and no doubt young Reynolds, who had all the grammar of his art to learn, looked with deep respect on the pictures, finished and unfinished, which hung round the studio of his new master, and felt the dignity and responsibility of his position when brought into the contact of even a subordinate with the great Sir Robert Walpole, when that statesman came to have his velvet-and-lace coat, his waistcoat, his wig, and his face recorded with an equal, inanimate propriety.

Very slight records exist of the work done and the life lived in Hudson's studio. Reynolds copied the drawings of Guercino with great success, as well as his master's pictures, and probably painted in subordinate parts of the originals. So far as the art of drawing and painting faces is concerned, his oppor-

tunities were favourable enough. Beyond this they were barren in the extreme. The young students of our own day can go to the British Museum, the schools at South Kensington, the schools of the Royal Academy, and find plenty of casts from the antique to awaken effort, to cultivate the sense of beauty, and to give knowledge of the structure of the human figure, and the requirements of pure outline. Few such things would ever meet the eye of the pupil of Hudson. It will help us to look with tolerance on the want of substantial knowledge of form, in all but the head, from which Reynolds suffered through life, if we reflect that—from the age of seventeen to twenty, the years when the eye and memory are most keen and strongly alive to impression—he missed entirely that glorious instruction which even the sight of the antique furnishes; and, consequently, that knowledge, the required extent of which is not appreciated by general observers, but which Barry compares to enlarged geographical science. The promontories, hills, and vales of the human face are difficult enough to map out, to say nothing of their relation to expression; but the endless involutions of a human body, in its varying proportions between the Hercules and the Venus—in its strange changes of contour under muscular action, and especially in that refined superficies of form and colour which overlays the deep life below—constitute materials for a science needing the best years of life for its acquirement. Michael Angelo gained it in perfection; but we are told that he spent twelve years in the close study of anatomy as one of the preliminaries of its attainment. Twelve, twenty, or fifty years, however, without the higher perception of the relation of form to expression and action, would be insufficient.

The wonder is that Reynolds, with such slender opportunities, did so well; nor is it reverent or just for the youthful student, surrounded by "Gladiators" and "Discoboli" from his school-days, to affect contempt for the "drawing" of the great master, who, till he was eight-and-twenty, probably only knew the antique from bad prints, or from a few maimed and yellow marbles, brought over on "the grand tour" by *dilettanti* noblemen. His study of the face must have been profound; and the broad, deep, tender strength with which from an early age he laid in the features in their relative places, with their due retiring subordination, shows how much he gained by being shut up to a narrow circle of observation and study. There is a penalty often to be paid for extended opportunities. Lawrence could draw with immense knowledge

and subtle grace; but in his excess of science, we see, perhaps, one of the causes of his inferiority to Reynolds in painting the face. He knew too much for his general powers. Reynolds' general powers always exceeded his knowledge. A fine head by Reynolds gives the impression of its having been painted by a philosopher, which cannot be said of most works from the more perturbed, if more scientific, pencil of Sir Thomas Lawrence.

It is said that Reynolds left Hudson's studio through some mutual misunderstanding. He remained, however, in after life in friendly relations with his old master; and though some slight "tiff" might be the occasion of their parting, the true reason probably was, that having seen how to set the palette and paint the head throughout, from dead colouring to glazing, and longing to infuse life on his own account into heads tolerably well painted, he began to tire of the everlasting round of blue velvet and cocked hat.

Whether he made much way in society during this early London sojourn, we are not informed. He probably, at that time, saw and admired Garrick when he brought his quick and vivid powers to bear on the dull and stilted forms of theatrical art. An interesting anecdote of the period must not be omitted. At a public auction, where young Reynolds was present, there arose a buzz and a whisper as the distorted form of the poet Pope walked through a yielding crowd, dispensing salutations and shaking hands, and not refusing the hand of the youthful painter, stretched out in an impulse of respectful enthusiasm. This, to readers familiar with the incidents of the life of Reynolds, is sure to recall a similar act of homage paid by Northcote to Sir Joshua, on one of his visits to Devonshire. Northcote touched the skirt of his coat "with much satisfaction," delighted to be so near the man whom he adored as a painter.

In the days when Daguerre was not, an average skill in portraiture was a sure foundation for respectable livelihood, if coupled with moderate diligence, prudence, and manners. Reynolds became for a while a country artist. A delightful little volume of sketches of country artists might be written, after the manner of the shorter lives of Allan Cunningham. Till about the year 1855 there was no mode of livelihood more secure and pleasant than that of the unambitious country portrait-painter of any ability or conduct. Oil pictures of the heads of households were things as necessary to equipment as the sideboard and the sofa. The great blemish on the mass of the tribe who supplied this inevitable demand was, per-

haps, an excess of conviviality.* Nothing placed two men, who had dealings with each other in those days, on a more pleasant footing than that of painter and sitter. The sitter was desirous of looking his best in the eyes of the painter, and of giving the best possible impression of his person and character. He was all smiles, all hospitality and concession. The painter wished to see his subject at his ease. It was seldom that the painter had not some other unwonted gift. He sang or fiddled, or was a mimic, or had "a fund of anecdote." His continual and varied intercourse with others gave a charm to his manners, and he became the lion of many a little country circle; but in much danger, if he were not a man of higher tastes, of sinking gradually into the red-nosed lodger at an inn—the hero of a "portrait club;" the painter of signs to clear off scores, and too often sinking under a huge wave of work paid for, but unfinished, accumulated debts, and irresistible habits of intemperance.

Reynolds, judging from his own account of about three years of his young manhood, was in some danger of declining into the free-and-easy habits of his sect. He always lamented his waste of time and opportunity at this period. After the death of his father, in 1746, he took a house at Plymouth Dock, and there lived with his two unmarried sisters till 1749. Some attempts at landscape, belonging to these years, are extant. It was at about this period that he came into contact with another and very important portion of his teaching, the pictures of William Gandy, of Exeter, whose father was a pupil of Vandyke. Solemnity, force, and richness are said to mark many of these pictures; and a traditional saying of Gandy's, to the effect that the texture of oil paintings should resemble that of cream or cheese, weighed on the mind of Reynolds, and influenced him throughout his whole career. If the unlearned reader will look closely into the little picture of "Innocence" in the Vernon Gallery, he will understand what this technical aphorism meant.

It is interesting to observe, so far as prints can give the information, that Reynolds did not take any violent leap out of the Hudsonian position into his own higher walk. He moved upward on safe ground, and in his early portraits we can trace the process of animation and adventure. The shadows deepen, and the lights brighten here and there. The titled

* One of these men (who painted in the Sir William Beechey style, red curtain and ruddy face), when asked at what period of the day he painted best, replied, "I always paint *boldest* after dinner."

dame pushes her stiff shoulder a little further towards action, and sometimes ventures to lay her bent wrist on the waist, angling the elbow with spirit. The light veil begins to flutter; a stray lock is lifted by the breeze. "The dumb dead air," so particularly oppressive in the Hudson portrait, begins to roll and stir, and in due time we have the artist looking at us with an assured inquisitiveness from under his shading hand in the fine portrait which has been placed for us in the National Portrait Gallery. He was early taken under the patronage of Lord Edgumbe, and it was at Lord Edgumbe's house that he met with Commodore Keppel, to whose good offices thus early in life so much of Reynolds' bright fortune is owing. Both were young: Keppel, twenty-four; Reynolds, twenty-six. "The Centurion" lay in the Channel, bound for the coast of Africa. Keppel generously offered to show his young acquaintance something of the world and to take him to Italy; thus a warm friendship commenced which lasted through life, and was at all periods of great professional advantage to the painter. It also helped, undoubtedly, to give that political complexion to his life which Mr. Taylor has pointed out as being so significant. Life on board a man-of-war for four months, at that stage of a young artist's life, must have been an important fact in his training, and the character of Keppel must have influenced his own. Keppel was of Dutch extraction, well born, and valuing more than many (so says Burke) the advantages of birth; yet he was frank, friendly, and brave. In the Commodore's company he spent a week at Lisbon; saw the great procession and the great bull-fight; saw Cadiz, Gibraltar, Tetuan, Algiers, and at Algiers saw the Dey of Algiers, and witnessed a remarkable interview between that potentate and the bold and calm British officer, when that "beardless boy," as the Dey called him, threatened bombardment. At Minorca, the name of which was in a few years to become the key-note of popular fury, he was entertained so long that he had time to paint almost all the officers of the garrison. He asked but small prices, three guineas a head; and to the rapid production of pictures at this price must be attributed something of the speed and facility for which his pencil was afterwards remarkable. It was at Minorca that he was thrown from his horse, and received that cut on the lip which gives so peculiar a cast to the Reynolds mouth. In course of time he was landed at Leghorn, and entered the region of enchantment to all artists. He was now to see what Richardson had taught him to wonder at, and almost to worship. He hastened onwards to Rome,

and another and the most important stage of his education began.

It is a soothing prelude to the marvellously active life of Reynolds, to hear his account of the manner in which those two years were spent in Rome. There is an expression occurring more than once in these memoirs, that shows his development to have been, though cautious and slow at first, by no means accidental. "I considered," says he, "that I had a great game to play." He sat down to his great game with eminent deliberation. That he might have time for study, he borrowed money from his married sisters, who seem to have been in good circumstances. He did not seek commissions from the travelling lords who were willing to pay for copies of notable works. He did not copy, during all his stay in Italy, more than a very few of the great pictures. He did not paint serious portraits. He did, though, what is exceedingly anomalous. He painted two or three of that uninteresting class of pictures, called in those days "*caricaturas*." One of these, representing some noisy funny scene between tutor, lord, courier, and innkeeper, was exhibited not long ago at the British Institution, and showed but a feeble sense of humour, with not much painting power. It had the look of work done to oblige a patron who mistook, as men often do, verbal or historic humour for pictorial. His method was to make small studies and sketches, according to their relation to the governing excellence of the work before him, and plenty of written memoranda and slight pencillings for the purpose of fixing on his memory the great things he might never, and as it proved did never, see again. The years 1750 and 1751 were passed in this way to memorable advantage, and under very favourable conditions. It is pleasant to imagine him during this happy recess, sitting, standing, or lying, "through whole solemn hours," under the awful shades of the Sistine, "capable of the emotions which Michael Angelo intended to excite," or waiting breathless with close investigation before the "*Heliodorus*," or the "*Miracle of Bolsena*," or the "*Disputa*," or that airy Hill of the Muses, till the true light of taste dawned upon him, and he felt himself able to understand what, he confesses with genuine simplicity, he was at first sight unable thoroughly to receive or enjoy. By the way, this would be a good subject for a note to another edition of the "*Modern Painters*,"—"How far was Reynolds right in his first impression of Raphael, and wrong in his second?" Mr. Ruskin's analysis of the cartoon of "*Christ's Charge to Peter*," in the third

volume of "Modern Painters," may be compared with Reynolds' first and instinctive judgment of the pictures in the Vatican. After Rome he visited Florence, Bologna, and Venice, conceiving too high an opinion of the eclectic schools, but finding what he was best fitted to understand and love in Venice among the works of Titian, Veronese, the Bassani, and Tintoretto.

In 1752, on the 16th of October, Reynolds arrived in London, and laid down the first stake in the great game he proposed to play.

His capital consisted of a body and mind charged to the full with life, health, energy—the grammar of Hudson, the hints of Gandy, the rapid practice of Plymouth and Minorca, the "grand gusto" of Rome, the combinations of Bologna, and the superb ornamentalism of Venice, the experience of a traveller, the rudiments of a scholar, and the capacity of a philosopher. In addition, he had made some mechanical preparations; he had contrived that some prelusive strains of fame should reach the ears of London before he arrived, and he brought with him an Italian "drapery man."

The drapery man was a necessary appendage in every fashionable studio of those days. Unless a little of the manufactory is conjoined with the higher uses of art, fortune cannot be secured, and to our minds it is very observable that position, taken in the social sense, and fortune in the banking sense, were distinct and important parts of the great Reynolds' "game." *He meant to have everything the earth could give him, and he got it.* The name of the young Italian was Giuseppe Marchi, and one of his master's earliest doings was a portrait of his pupil in a turban. It is not an astounding picture; and Hudson told him plainly that he did not paint so well as before he went to Italy.

Reynolds did not return to a soil entirely barren of art, though it was barren of all patronage except for portrait painting. In 1750, Hogarth's "Marriage à la Mode" was knocked down at a public auction for £110. The frames alone of this series cost him £24, so that for these matchless works he was paid at the rate of less than £15 each. He had shown great ability in portraiture long before this. The portrait of Captain Coram, at Foundling Hospital, is full of life and power, as no doubt was many another from the same hand. He was not fitted, however, either by his skill or manners, to take the place of a popular portrait painter. At this time he had mistaken his way, and was at work on sacred subjects. He had the "Paul before Felix" on his

easel. If Paul had been what his accusers said he was, "a pestilent fellow," and Felix a Bow-street magistrate, Hogarth was the man to have given us an immortal work—the real Paul and Felix were above his reach.

Richard Wilson had been a portrait painter, but was now beginning that sorrowful career of landscape—landscape poetic, forlorn and grand—which helped so much to raise our landscape art, and so little to supply his own necessities. A Swiss painter, Liotard, was in possession of the field of portrait just then. He was a *neat* painter, but his neatness could not stand long before the importation of novelty, life and strength fresh from abroad, and he disappeared.

The first work of the painter which attracted public attention was a vigorous full length of Commodore Keppel, standing on a stormy sea-shore, and with animation giving directions to unseen figures on the beach. The attitude was adapted from a pencil sketch of an antique statue picked up somewhere in his travels, and marks from the first his habit of using the ideas of others whenever he could do so with advantage.

Leslie, in his charming "Handbook for Young Painters," has a remark which will help us to estimate Reynolds all the more accurately. "I have no hesitation," he writes, "in saying, that every artist whose name has lived, owes his immortality more to the excellence of his taste, than to any other single endowment; because it displays all the rest to their fullest advantage, and without it his mind would be imperfectly seen; and if taste be not the highest gift of the painter, it is, I think, the rarest." This rare gift was possessed by Reynolds in an unwonted degree. This and another characteristic, midway between taste and humour—the power to see "the weak side of things"—enabled him to use the inventions of others with consummate judgment. His fine eye and delicate hand, so cool and light, enabled him to give the charm of freshness and naturalness, which prevented the spectator from tracing the origin of his ideas. His mind was appreciative, not inventive. He saw no visions; he dreamed no dreams. But he was alive to the airiest and most subtle charms of the visible. All in his life and thinking was eminently actual and outward. It is where the mind is equally balanced between the visionary spontaneity of imagination, and the quiet, keen perception of outward fact, that the few highest masters of art are manifested,—the Michael Angelo, the Raphael, the Titian, the Shakespeare,—and no man of this class can consent to borrow, though occasionally, as Raphael did, he may condescend to adapt.

His first house was at No. 104, St. Martin's Lane, near the studio of Roubilliac. He removed soon after to No. 5, Great Newport Street, his sister Frances taking the management of his house. The brother and sister were not congenial souls. He was even; she was fretful and full of "megrimms." She painted miniatures, and copied her brother's pictures. "These copies," said her brother, "make other people laugh and me cry." After a few years they separated. The principles on which he commenced his life-work are early apparent, and continued ever after to guide him. He had a settled, and indeed an exaggerated, conviction of the importance of labour. Feeling his slowness of invention, he made the best reflection under the circumstances—namely, that great facility often induces haste and carelessness. The tortoise in the actual result of the race of life not seldom distances the hare. He began with the determination to "go to his studio willing or unwilling, morning, noon, and night," a resolve differing from that of Stothard, who walked the streets daily for hours, drinking in health, and catching sudden and fleeting graces from the moving life around him. Reynolds was too much of an in-door artist all his life. He took, however, every pains to learn painting from paintings. He bought what good works of the old masters he could afford to buy; he "even borrowed money for that purpose, believing them to be for a painter the best kind of wealth." He went so far as to tell Northcote, that "for a really fine specimen of Titian he would consent to ruin himself." He died worth eighty thousand pounds in money, and surely if he had only *half* ruined himself, he might have attained his wish. He thought India-stock valuable as well as Titians, and tried to dispose of his Titians before he died.

He made systematic experiments in effect and colour, "leaving out every colour in turn, and showing it that he could do without it." He peered into, and chipped, and filed away and dissolved portions of old paintings to get at the "Venetian secret." In painting his pictures he exhibited, perhaps, his most marked peculiarity of mind, always looking on them "as a whole." It is this breadth of view, this tendency to generalize and mass, this breath of the philosophic spirit which gives so much of the air of greatness to his works.

At first his use of materials was tolerably simple and safe. The aim at brilliance and richness induced him from the first to use fleeting colours if they were splendid in hue. It may be questioned whether he was not misled afterwards by the Gandy theory about cream and cheese. In his more successful

efforts after this quality there is a species of charm on close inspection. But not only is it true that at the focal distance mere richness of pigment is lost, but it may also be respectfully denied that human flesh is like "cream or cheese" in texture. It is not like anything which may not be successfully imitated with such simple media as Gainsborough used. There is a tendency in some artists and connoisseurs to confuse the sweetness of the face with the sweetness of something to eat, and to such eyes the dry and airy world is "embedded and enjellied" in unctuous semi-transparency. One of the cant phrases of this school goes beyond the Gandy idea. It is accounted to be an excellence in a picture that it should look "buttery."

We meet with one excellent resolve in the beginning of his public life, the want of which spoils many a young painter,—to do his best at each succeeding picture whether the subject were attractive or not. Moreover, his "grand tour," his Italian studies, his many qualifications, did not overwhelm his prudence. He began to paint at the very moderate price of five guineas a head.

The political sketches which fill so many pages of the book, interesting and well written as they are, may be passed lightly over; for, except that Reynolds' career was undoubtedly influenced by his early associations with the party in opposition, we meet with no expressions of political sentiment, and only one political act—his voting for Fox—and we have abundant evidence that to him a man's politics were no barrier to intercourse. He was found one day at the table of Wilkes, and the next day he dined with Johnson; and, during the grand and celebrated "Impeachment," we find him on one day sharing the hospitality of Warren Hastings, and the next he has his feet under the table of Burke.

The times of his appearance before the world are not pleasant to read of. "Coarse, rollicking, and hearty" they were; drinking and gambling, and dissolute times in a degree that disgusts, while the narrative of it amuses; days of fearful political corruption, when men would do anything for power, when the paymaster of the forces thought it no shame to pocket the interest of the money in his hands, and when "secret service money" meant money for buying votes for the government. Truly, "the canker of peace" looked festering enough, and there is a sort of pleasure in seeing the wild passion of the upper-class men of those days becoming purged and noble with the bursting out of "the blossom of war with a heart of fire." It seems better that they

should die bravely among the thunders of the fleet in Newfoundland mists, or leave their bones in the parched Carnatic, than thrust one another through in the stews of London.

Into the mixed society of this era Reynolds was well prepared to enter. He had, young as he was, seen much good company. He had firm nerves, a quiet unobtrusive self-reliance, and his speech was considerate and wise. He had none of that moodiness and inequality of temper so often the counterbalance of genius; yet, as we see by many instances, there was, under a calm exterior, a spirit of insatiable curiosity and restless observation. Little disturbed by thronging fancies from within, he was free to fix with more accuracy on impressions from without, and gather them home their for his use. People who had no great public events to fill mouths were talking of "Sir Charles Grandison," "Gray's Elegy," "Peregrine Pickle," and Johnson's Dictionary, and it was not long before he crossed the path of "*Ursa Major*" himself. They were friends at a stroke. They first met at the house of the daughters of Admiral Cotterell. One of the ladies lamented the death of a friend to whom they were under great obligations. "You will," said the penetrating young portrait painter, who had seen the world out of the studio as well as in it, "at least be set free from the burden of obligation." This acute, caustic, and daring saying caught the quick ear of Johnson. It was "of a higher mood" than the common-places of polite society. He went home to sup with Reynolds, and in this way commenced a long friendship, founded in mutual esteem and admiration, between two men as dissimilar in most respects as could well be. Their acquaintance was a fortunate occurrence for both. In Johnson, Reynolds found his most influential teacher; and in Reynolds, Johnson found his tenderest and most considerate friend.

As yet, the star of Burke, who was to rise, according to Macaulay, "in amplitude of comprehension and richness of imagination superior to every orator ancient or modern," was below the horizon. He was then twenty-three years old, reading for the bar, contributing to papers and periodicals, turning over in his mind the question of the propriety of his emigrating, or the prospect of a consulship, and meditating on "the sublime and beautiful." Goldsmith, at the age of twenty-five, was going northward to study medicine, to learn, as Beauclerk put it afterwards, "to kill those who were not his enemies." Reynolds himself was nearly thirty, well trained, and in the best order for the race of life.

In 1754, there was a great awakening of public interest and excitement. The horizons east and west, in India and America, were troubled, and, says Reynolds' biographer, "few periods of our history were more stirring than the years from 1754 to 1760." To any one interested at once in history and in art, the connection between the public events of the whole period of Reynolds' activity and the shadowy studio in which so many of the remarkable men of the time sat from year to year, would be an exceedingly delightful branch of study, and would help to realise and enkindle his conception of the time. So many engravings exist from the long series of Reynolds' portraits, that a very complete historic collection may be hung in the galleries of the mind from this source alone; and this is, of course, the thread of connection by which the historic and biographic portions of these volumes are bound together. In 1755 we find the painter in fully established business, and are able, from this date, to follow his doings pretty closely by means of those pocket-books which it would be a pleasure to see and handle; filled slowly from day to day, through a course of nearly forty years, with names that create a slight thrill as we read them, and rendered the more racy from a certain want of genius for spelling, which was a small set-off against so many other excellent gifts.

In this first recorded year we have not less than 120 sitters. Two portraits per week (when many of them would be large and some full-length pictures) seems hard work; but we must remember the valuable co-operation of "the drapery man." It was a point with him never to be seen out of his studio in the day-time; perhaps, for him, with his in-doors imagination, the best course. But it would seem as if he were equally careful, except when he received company, never to be found at home after dark. He lived in the age of clubs. He made the club his library and news-room, and had the good sense to choose as companions those who could teach him; men whose business it was to read, think, and write. His close study was of pictures; but he was a shrewd, humorous, and delighted observer of life and manners. He was not a talker, and hated talking artists, but he was a delicate, discriminative, and generous *listener*. The ear-trumpet is typical. In his power of listening with intelligence lies one of the great secrets of his power of making and keeping such dissimilar friends as Johnson, Burke, Goldsmith, Gibbon, Wilkes, and a host of others, who, at constant feud with each other, were all agreed in their warm attachment to Reynolds.

He began with an artists' club, and at "Slaughter's Coffee House" met weekly with his old master, Hudson, with Roubilliac, the sculptor, Gravelot and M'Ardell, the engravers, Hogarth and Frank Hayman, rough and ready. We have now to trace broadly a career of unexampled good fortune, reaching over two-and-twenty years, in which no rival showed his face, and during which he was the lord paramount of portraiture in Britain. Of the 120 names of sitters recorded in the first pocket-book, a fourth are those of people of high title, beside two or three admirals, as many baronets, colonels, and captains. Among the admirals are Lord Anson, then resting from his labours in the dignity of First Lord of the Admiralty, and Boscawen, painted immediately before he set sail for Newfoundland on the breaking out of hostilities with France. There is the name of Lord Ligonier, a French Protestant refugee, who became Generalissimo, one of Marlborough's heroes. He died in 1770, at the age of ninety-two. It is supposed that Reynolds' endeavour to paint the old man's features as they might have appeared years before in the fields of Flanders, led to its being, as it certainly is, poorly painted as to the face. For seven laborious years Reynolds seems to have thrown all his powers into the work of achieving a position. He worked incessantly, and with rapidly developing power. The portrait of Dr. Johnson, which was engraved in Boswell's "Life," where he is sitting in a homely, check-covered chair, by a homely table, into which he is plunging his left fist, or dropping it like a paw, the legs wide apart, the head hung heavily aside, the eyes looking askance for his weighty idea which the charged pen waits to record, was done in 1756, and shows how much life and daring his pencil had by this time acquired.

During that heaving and convulsive year, when war blazed out all over the world, he seems to have worked harder than at any period of his career. Northcote remarks the year 1758 as having been the busiest of all Reynolds' years. He painted in it the surprising number of 150 portraits. William of Culloden, now less favourably known as William of Kloster Seven, is found among this mass of subjects; Lady Coventry, one of the celebrated Miss Gunnings of the year when he returned from Italy, and now dying of consumption; Commodore Edgecumbe, "fresh from the triumphs of Louisbourg;" and Mrs. Horneck, hereafter to be better known as the friend of Goldsmith; have their names on this year's list, and, as showing the martial spirit of the time, and an admirable type

of it, the striking full length of Sir Francis Deleval as a volunteer, evidently defying the world, by all that is signified between musket-stock and bayonet-point, his hat cocked bravely on his head.

Mrs. Pelham, feeding her chickens, abundantly more charming than if she were sacrificing to the Graces, or wielding the bow of Diana with a three-inch crescent perched on her head-dress, also sat or stood; and the extravagant and lively Kitty Fisher, so often afterwards painted by Reynolds, now represented as nursing doves, with a dove-like grace and innocence of look, but belonging to a class of which the dove is not the most appropriate emblem. Many of this class were brought to him from time to time, La Renas and Checcinas, Phrynes and Thais, whom he painted for the random gambling lords who imported them. Kitty Fisher is said to have squandered £12,000 in nine months. It was this Cleopatra-like profusion which probably suggested to Reynolds the not unapt rendering of her in the character of the "swarthy queen with bold black eyes," dissolving a pearl in her wine cup.

Seamen lately renowned for gallant actions with French privateers were there; admirals who saw Wolfe land at Quebec, and brought home the news of his death; soldiers came to tell how the day went on the field of Minden, or left his studio to fall amid the smoke of Kempen, or to mix in other onsets in that dreadful, useless struggle for the province of Silesia, "for the sake of which the life-blood of more than a million was poured out like water." "Yellow Jacks" and "Black Dicks," dogged commodores and daring captains; Lord George Sackville and the Colonel Fitzroy who took the disobeyed orders of Prince Ferdinand to Lord George on the field; commanders of secret expeditions; colonels who had stood round George the Second in battle, and one (Colonel Trapaud) who prevented the king's horse from rushing into the French lines; are all found in turn seated in the quiet studio chair, with their stories of march and charge and beleaguering by the Rhine, the Weser, or the Elbe.

Country mayors, like Sir William Blackett, whose picture is in the Infirmary at Newcastle-on-Tyne; clerical men and men of learning, such as Dr. Markham, afterwards Archbishop of York; comedians like Harry Woodward, "brisk and breezy;" tragedians like Barry, and one who lived between both comedy and tragedy like Garrick; are succeeded by men

"Wearing a lofty and a serious brow,
Sad, high, and working full of state and woe,"

like Sir Septimus Robinson, Usher of the Black Rod, whose sittings are "always very early;" and mixed with these "a bevy of fair women richly dressed;" duchess, and marchioness, and countess, and lady; the noble's mistress; the squire's dame and young ones, the father's pride and the mother's joy. Such a bringing together of the image of an age as is only seen in the studio of the fashionable portrait painter.

One of the very memorable portraits of this stage of Reynolds' career is that of Laurence Sterne, the lion of society, whom to meet, "it was needful," says Gray the poet, "to have invitations a fortnight beforehand." On this picture Leslie makes the subtle criticism that he is not simply resting his head on his hand as in thought, but is at the same time propping himself up, as one in feeble health, and that the wig is tilted slightly on the head, giving it the rakish Shandean air which characterises it. The whole picture is individual; the eyes stare and burn impudently close under the square brow; the expression so incongruous with a clerical costume, is that of one who neither fears God nor regards man. This picture was presented to Sterne by Reynolds, and might possibly be a repayment of the most compact and felicitous description of the style of Reynolds which we know. "Reynolds himself, *great and graceful as he paints*, might have painted him as he sat." Sterne tampered with the pencil on his own account, and would know how to value such a gift. The resolute diligence and freedom from all rivalry of these first seven years; the increase of his prices, which had gradually risen from five to twenty-five guineas, while the full length had reached a hundred guineas, had so enlarged his means as to warrant his removal to a larger house at No. 47, Leicester Square. He gave £1,650 for a forty years' lease (which he almost lived to see expired), made additions to the extent of £1,500 more, in the shape of a gallery and studio, and at the early age of thirty-seven set up his carriage—a gorgeous affair indeed—painted as to the panels with the four seasons by Catton, and furnished with footmen in silver lace. This outburst exhausted his savings; but, as his practice was large and his diligence great, he was able soon to replenish his purse, and to lay the foundation of an ample fortune. We find that ere long his yearly income amounted to £6,000.

Here, already remarkable for the snuff (Hardman's, 37 Strand) and the ear trumpet which single him out to the eye, he was found established at the accession of George the Third.

The Royal Marriage took place in 1761, and one of the best of his allegorical pictures was soon after painted,—that of Lady Elizabeth Keppel, one of the bridesmaids, sister of his early friend the Commodore. She was represented in the character of a votary adorning the altar of Hymen with long wreaths of flowers, and attended by a maiden who is preparing some sort of libation in an urn. The huge Earl of Errol sat about the same time, “a colossus in cloth of gold,” whom Horace Walpole compared to “one of the giants in the Guildhall new-gilt.”

The spirits sink unaccountably among these allegorical pictures in spite of the classics and the gods. Among his *Didos* embracing Cupid, his *Hopes and Loves and Graces*, it is pleasing to come upon the natural and probable group of Lady Sarah Lennox and Lady Susan Strangways, with the youthful Charles James Fox. One of the ladies leans out of window, the other raises a dove to her caress, and the young Fox invites them to a rehearsal. The red bricks of Holland House look more real and stimulating than the gloomy mauve-soleums and prophetic cells in which his unwowed “votaries” are performing their sham sacrifices that make us yawn vehemently and wish they were over. The Earl of Bute in blue velvet and gold, the Princess Augusta, the witty, careless, clever, unprincipled Charles Townshend, the proposer of that memorable Colonial Stamp Act which set a-ringing the ominous muffled bells of Boston (and who made the wicked joke on another sitter, a stout and wealthy heiress, that “her tonnage was equal to her poundage”). Lord Holland, Lord Chief Justice Pratt, afterwards Lord Camden, and closely concerned in the after disputes as to the legality of general warrants; Lord Granby, Master-General of Ordnance, and the subject of one of his most striking whole lengths, Count Lippe Schaumburg, “soldier, statesman, and man of letters,” found their way early to the new studio in Leicester Square. The Count’s picture is a large full length on a square canvas. He stands, long-faced, long-chinned, dark-eyed, at once pleasant and grim, against a wild sky full of rolling glooms and gleams, and in the shade around him finely disposed emblems of war—mortar, and cannon-wheel, and ball, a charger with ruffled mane below, a banner with dropping fold behind him. Equally fine is the Vandyke-like portrait of Sir Geoffrey Amherst, in plate armour, his helmet resting on some plan of siege or battle-field.

Hogarth died in 1764, and the Literary Club was formed the same year, meeting till 1775 at the Turk’s Head in

Gerrard Street. During the summer the ceaseless and ardent toils of Reynolds told upon his health, and he was laid aside for a while by severe illness. All that relates to that glorious circle, gathered round "the brown table" at "the Club," is intensely attractive. It was the intellectual centre of the time. There Johnson ruled, "predominating" like the huge bear over the gate of the Baron of Bradwardine. Our feelings veer like the wind as we look at the bulk and texture of the "literary leviathan," so strangely put together. At one moment the eye moistens in admiration of his nobility and tenderness; at another moment we shrink and collapse as if we had been personally struck down and trampled in unexpected assault.

We see Edmund Burke, who raises our conceptions of the possibilities of human nature, and touches us, like the prelude of an oratorio, with the sense of wonder and expectancy. Burke was a match for Johnson in talk. Reynolds was his match also, but in another way, and the Doctor found and pronounced him "invulnerable." A constant association with every class of men and women; a quick, quiet eye, which could discover the coming storm at a distance; a genial and not easily ruffled temper (to the excellence of which, the most striking if somewhat strongly pronounced testimony is that of Northcote, that "you might put the *Divil* on Reynolds' back, without putting him in a fidget"); a perception of "the weak side of things," which Goldsmith lacked; and a well-filled purse, carried Reynolds through thirty years of close association with Dr. Johnson with scarcely a ripple of discordance, and it confirms our admiration of the firmness and expansiveness of Reynolds' understanding, that he should cultivate so near an intercourse with one who, beside being purblind, or, perhaps, partly because he *was* purblind, had not the least sympathy with the painter's pursuits. There are many interesting and graphic notices in these volumes of the doings and sayings of this memorable club, and Mr. Taylor has found such fascination in even its wine accounts, that he gives us the average consumption per man of the port and claret, which were the main beverages.

Reynolds was one of the most regular attendants there, but he by no means confined his attention to this awful centre of intellectual law. He seems to have been as fond of the society of men of fashion as men of literature and art. He was a frequenter of a notorious club composed of "maccaronis" and "bloods," whose chief pursuits were hard drinking, deep gaming, and blasphemous profanity. Here he

was distinguished for his ceremonious politeness and his bad whist-playing. Through all his laborious life we see in him nothing of the dreamy, secluded student. When not at his easel he was about among men; beefsteak clubs, sçavoir vivre clubs, saur-kraut clubs, ladies' clubs, gambling clubs; no clubs came amiss to him where "life" was to be seen. Along with clubs came endless dinner engagements, as various as his portraits; great dukes and lords, bishops and politicians, Wilkes and Johnson, Burke and Warren Hastings, keen-tongued, card-playing Kitty Clive, all these, as well as, or more often than, the artist or connoisseur, were his daily table companions. When dinners were over, then to Vauxhall and Ranelagh, and the Pantheon and Mrs. Corneley's masquerades, to balls and assemblies, to "chaoses," and queer collections of "blues." While Gainsborough, in after years, sat by his lamp at home throwing his exquisite sketches under the table, or Romney, whose "solitude was sublime," brooded in front of his cartoons, Reynolds was still in and out of the congregations of men.

It is this ceaseless energy, this tranquil vivacity, this unappeasable curiosity for the things of the present, that formed a very large element and a very central secret of his great power and influence. He also knew the meaning of the saying of Ulysses—

"To have done is to hang
Quite out of fashion, like a rusty mail,
In monumental mockery . . .
For emulation hath a thousand sons,
That one by one pursue; if you give way,
Or hedge aside from the direct forthright,
Like to an entered tide, they all rush by
And leave you hindmost."

To complete the image of exuberant life, we must see him occasionally on horseback going across country after the hounds, or in the stubble bagging the game, or betting Mr. Parker five guineas that he will hit a mark. Alive, alert, with next to unfailing health and unflagging spirits, we see him gathering more of the materials of a whole success than any man of his time. It was not in the supreme force of any one gift that we discern the pre-eminence of our Sir Joshua. He aimed at fame, and fortune, and influence, and the enjoyment of the passing hour, and at general culture so far as it could be obtained by a thorough-going man of the world, as he undoubtedly was. He looked after the small things that enhance success. In the poem written by Warton on the

Oxford Window, he is desirous to have his name "hitched in," so that the praise may have its full personal force; and he made his sister ride about in his gilded coach, that people might ask, if Northcote does not mislead us, "Whose coach is that?" and that people might answer, "That is the coach of Sir Joshua Reynolds, the eminent portrait painter."

Perhaps the political event in which Reynolds would be most likely to have a strong personal interest was the brief accession to power of the Rockingham administration, in which the Edmund Burke of the club and the Edmund Burke of Reynolds' counsels and affections was "the foremost man." In an age when all good things were bought and sold, the sight of "a ministry who practised no corruption, nor were ever suspected of any, sold no offices, obtained no reversions or pensions, either coming in or going out, for themselves, their families, or their dependants," is soothing and cheering, and sheds a pleasant reflected light on the course of this biography. The splendour was soon eclipsed. In 1782 it gleamed out again like the sun on an October day, but we see the long course of Burke's magnificent life passed in the shade and storm of opposition, to die out under the lurid conflagration, which was mistaken for sunrise, of the French Revolution.

In 1768 Reynolds paid a visit to Paris, setting out on the 9th of September, with Richard Burke, the talkative, light-hearted and random brother of Edmund. They had only two breaks-down in their posting; saw Abbeville, Amiens, St. Just, Chantilly, St. Denis, the galleries, the theatres, Prévile and Molé; "lay at Sittingbourne" on the return journey; and arrived in London on the 8th of October.

On the 9th of December Reynolds was hailed President of the Royal Academy, which had been formed in his absence, and shortly afterwards he left a sitter for the levée and returned—Sir Joshua Reynolds—to his usual labours. These honours made Johnson break his resolution against wine, and we may fancy the scene at No. 47, when his health was drunk by Burke and the rest of that high company.

The scheme of an Academy of Arts was first originated in 1755, between the artists and the Dilettanti Society. It was placed on its present basis in this year of 1768. It has been frequently, sometimes violently attacked. Leslie in this book enters on an elaborate defence and eulogy of it. His *collaborateur* differs from him; and it is not unfair to refer to the expressed opinions of Mr. Taylor, seeing that they are accessible to all in a blue-book. Mr. Taylor was examined

by the royal commission which sat to investigate the constitution of the Academy in 1863. He speaks mildly of the Academy in the *Life of Reynolds*; but not with much warm approval in the *blue-book*. The most real ground of assault has not been, however, against the Royal Academy *as* an academy. It is out of the annual exhibition over which it has the control that so many heart-burnings have chiefly arisen. There is no other arena open to the artist where there is anything like a fair opportunity of being seen by the generality of buyers and patrons; yet it has been thought that the interests of members of the Academy have been too exclusively consulted. They have a right to send a large number of works year by year, and to have these works hung in the best places. If their works were necessarily more excellent than others, this would not be felt to be a grievance. In the early days of the institution its members included every good painter. It is not so now; and while such painters as Holman Hunt, G. F. Watts, Linnell, Rossetti, Madox Brown, W. B. Scott, and others are known not to be members of the Academy, no young painter of ability will be, for the honour's sake, very anxious to add the mystic letters to his name. Still, there is the question of the market. If work is not seen it cannot be bought, and where can it be efficiently seen by the mass of buyers but at the Royal Academy?

To our mind the whole system of temporary exhibition is unpleasant. The crush, the heat, the whirl, the golden flames that blaze round the walls, the mass of incongruous subjects huddled together, unfit the very organs of vision for correct seeing, and the mind for correct judging, and we dream of something more adapted to the wants of both painter and buyer: some long, quiet, accessible, well-known galleries where, if need be the year round, as the pictures hung at the National Galleries, or in the corridors of South Kensington, the newly-finished work may be put up and removed at pleasure, and where it may be seen without distraction. At present all is bitter contest; contest for admission, contest for proper hanging, contest for public applause. Now and then on the walls of South Kensington, the young painter's Paradise, we see a new picture (how it came there we know not, for the place is like a fairy palace, where unseen fingers work constantly new wonders), such as G. F. Watts' "*Sisters*." The delight of coming on such work with cool nerves and unthrobbed eyes is extreme.

Concerning the relative value and placing of the paintings in the exhibition of 1863, Mr. Taylor says, "This year the

worst pictures in almost every department of art, represented in the Royal Academy, are by Royal Academicians." And again he says, in conclusion, "I doubt whether the Royal Academy exercises an influence for good. The education is most defective, and the exhibition is not such as it ought to be to enhance the character of British art; it popularises it, but it does not raise it."

But whatever the Academy may be *now*, we have reason to be thankful for what it has done for art in this country. It has called public attention to art. It consolidated and trained the art spirit. It gave us Stothard, and Turner, and Wilkie, and Hilton, and Landseer, and Leslie. And its first president and most splendid name was Sir Joshua Reynolds.

He was now at the summit of fame and influence. He had taken a villa at Richmond, and had joined the life there as in London. He appears at the Richmond Assembly, and Mr. Taylor suggests that he very likely took lessons of Noverre, the great dancing master of the day.

We find the club in 1768 anxious about Goldsmith's new comedy. In the life of Johnson, Oliver Goldsmith stands out for more than a dozen years a conspicuous figure; but under the tempered light of the studio in Leicester Square, we see him in a more favourable aspect, and one more pleasant to our view. He was not laughed at, or cowed, or "knocked down with the butt end" of an argument there. Reynolds loved him, and painted him with the utmost tenderness of thought. Leslie has given us a fine criticism on this portrait, to which it is worth the reader's while to turn. Reynolds knew from experience that thought and inward power may exist where the faculty of rapid or collected utterance is denied to the tongue,—and the man of whom Garrick said, that he "wrote like an angel and talked like poor Poll," found a shelter in the sympathy of the man he learned to love like a brother. In the dedication to Sir Joshua of "The Deserted Village," Goldsmith wrote, "Setting interest aside, to which I never paid much attention, I must be indulged at present in following my affections. The only dedication I ever made, was to my brother, because I loved him better than most other men. He is since dead. Permit me to inscribe this poem to you."

Johnson was subsisting at this time on subscriptions to his Shakespeare, without the fortitude to record either the sums received or the names sent in. His friends were anxious about his honour, and Reynolds offered to assist him

with his pen. He helped him also with three contributions to "The Idler."

Reynolds found his pen a more serviceable instrument than his tongue, and did his best to train it. He projected and delivered from time to time a series of Discourses to the students of the Royal Academy. The first of these was given on the 2nd of January, 1769. He was not an orator. His voice was indistinct, his delivery dry and tame, but he was full of the sense of the intellectual importance of the art he professed. He congratulated the students that they had nothing to unlearn, exhorted them to obey rules, to take pains, and to remember that "nothing is denied to well-directed labour," that "labour will improve natural gifts," that "labour will even supply their deficiency," which may be in matters of art abundantly questioned.

It is curious to read the innumerable little episodes of his stirring life: such as his visits to Wilkes when in hiding; his dinners with him when in the King's Bench prison, and the accounts of the changeful society with which his evenings were spent. But we must hasten on.

It is to Northcote that we owe some of the most intimate and trustworthy details of the life of Reynolds. He became a pupil in the house of the painter, and left it after five years' faithful service. He was a man of third-rate ability in the art, but he ardently loved it and most sincerely admired Reynolds. He talked to the end of his days the broad Devonshire dialect which he brought to Leicester Square, and which Reynolds loved to hear. Under Hazlitt's pen in later years he appears a querulous, caustic, sagacious, penurious old man, with hollow and wizard-like eyes. In Leicester Square we see another figure—the busy, faithful, listening, provincial assistant, forwarding the huge full length, and astounded with mingled vexation and admiration when Sir Joshua enters, and with great strokes of the brush sweeps away into effective generalisation the careful work of days, or swoops on one of his pictures done from the tame eagle in the back-yard, to make it a bird of Jove by a few rufflings of the hand of the master. "The Prince of Wales says he knows you; where did you make his acquaintance?" asked Sir Joshua. "The Prince of Wales does *not* know me," answered Northcote, "it is only *his* brag."

In 1772 Reynolds painted Sir Joseph Banks, then newly returned from the expedition to Otaheite for the purpose of observing the transit of Venus. Here, again, the lively curiosity of his nature is displayed. He sought as frequently

as he could the society of Banks and Solander, and took the utmost interest in all their discoveries and observations.

It was Reynolds' habit, when not employed with portraits, to paint small fancy pictures, the models for which he found for the most part among the tribe of beggars—old men and children. He had painted the study of a head from a favourite high-featured old man, formerly a pavior, by name George White, now reduced to beggary. This picture was seen by Burke and others, and pointed out as being an admirable suggestion for the head of Count Ugolino, whose death in the Tower of Hunger forms so horrible an episode in the *Inferno* of Dante. Reynolds had before this entertained the intention of painting a picture from the scene, and he proceeded, on the hint of Burke, to produce what may be called his first historical picture. The design is well known by prints, and has several elements of power. The colour and composition are impressive, but it required greater gifts than Reynolds possessed to reach the tragic height of a subject not very well suited to art. It was while he was engaged on this work that the University of Oxford conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Civil Law, in companionship with Dr. Beattie, whose portrait he painted soon afterwards in gown and bands, holding his book on Truth, as the Vicar of Wakefield might hold *his* book on the Whistonian Controversy, while the Angel of Justice or Truth is thrusting down into darkness personifications of Infidelity and Scepticism. The figure of infidelity is made to bear a strong resemblance to Voltaire, while that of scepticism was said to resemble Hume. This treatment of the subject drew forth an indignant protest from Goldsmith. His objection was that Beattie, as a writer, was so much the inferior of Voltaire. Whether this be a just objection or not, there is surely great oddity in the combination of a matter-of-fact clergyman, with gown and bands and book, and the cloudy allegory in the background. The mixture of real and allegorical figures in Reynolds' picture of "Garriek between Tragedy and Comedy," has been reasonably objected to; but in this case there is more absurdity in the combination, owing to the prosaic literalness of the principal figure.

Sir Joshua's university honours were speedily followed by a civic elevation, which he had long coveted, and now much relished. He is found at Plympton going through the ceremony of being sworn in as mayor of his native town. It is said that he was not without hope of taking his seat in Parliament for the same place; but this never came to pass.

Twenty-two years of unbroken prosperity had passed over

him. His honours and emoluments had reached their highest point. He was no longer to remain the unquestioned master of the field of portraiture. Three men of mark began to make themselves felt in the world of art.

The first of these was James Barry, the son of a Cork skipper, now over thirty years old, and recently returned from Rome, where he had been sent by Edmund Burke, whose conduct to him raises Burke in our esteem. Barry was a man of great genius, but of unequal powers—fierce, gloomy, misanthropic, opinionated, sarcastic, and proud, with high views of the functions of art and large powers of invention, but failing in pictorial knowledge and taste. The second was Thomas Gainsborough. For some years past Wilshire's waggon had brought from Bath, where Gainsborough had since 1760 resided, noble landscapes and spirited portraits to the exhibition at Spring Gardens. These pictures secured high recognition in London. The painter of them was only four years younger than Sir Joshua, had studied in early life under Gravelot, the engraver, and Hayman, the painter, had met with good success at Ipswich and Bath as a portrait painter, and now resolved to set up his easel in the metropolis. He rented a part of the Duke of Schomberg's house in Pall Mall, for which he paid £300 a year, and shortly became more popular than Reynolds. The more moderate scale of his prices would no doubt contribute to this result; but he had a facility of pencil, an elegance, originality, and spirit of execution, which made some of his best portraits equal to some of the best works of Sir Joshua. In addition he had powers which Reynolds had not. Some of his landscapes are among the masterpieces of art; and in certain of his fancy subjects—cottage girls, woodmen, shepherd boys—there is a freshness and poetic power never reached by Reynolds. Yet so overshadowing and deeply rooted was the fame and influence of Reynolds, that it was not till the gathering of the Treasures of Art at Manchester, in 1857, that the full relative value of Gainsborough's works was seen by the British public. Reynolds had a hold on the whole life of his age which Gainsborough never attained. His habits were different from those of Reynolds. Not particularly well educated, he was shy, sensitive, fond of home, fond of music; he mixed little in general society, and never sought the company of the wits, or men of learning. For all that, he stands before us as the more specific type of the man of genius both by gifts and habitudes.

There was another rival in the field, whose natural powers

were probably of a higher cast than those of either Reynolds or Gainsborough. George Romney was born in 1734, in Lancashire, and was brought up to his father's trade as a cabinet-maker. He had few educational advantages. He studied portraiture under a country artist, Steele, in Kendal, and for five years practised there with great success. In 1762 he came to London, and began to paint portraits at the price of four guineas, which, by 1793, had risen to thirty-five guineas. From 1773 to 1775 he studied in Italy, and after his return his popularity as a portrait painter, though he did not after 1772 exhibit publicly, was unbounded. Romney was a friend of Flaxman the sculptor, and of Hayley and Cowper, unequally matched poets. His mode of execution was very simple. He was a good colourist, but did not aim at the fulness, richness, and depth of Reynolds. He had amazing power of striking in the forms of his subjects at once, and had altogether more elevation of thought and elasticity of fancy than Reynolds. He never did himself full justice in the walk where his powers were highest; but his "Shakespeare nursed by Tragedy and Comedy," his Titanias, and some of the heads for which Lady Hamilton was a frequent model, stand among the very first things in English art, and suggest possibilities far beyond anything he ever had the full opportunity of realising on canvas. "His heads," says Flaxman, a high authority, "were various. The male were decided and grand, the female lovely. His figures resembled the antique, the limbs were elegant and finely formed, his drapery well understood; few artists since the fifteenth century have been able to do so much in so many branches."

Reynolds had no longer the monopoly of portraiture, and we find from Northcote that from that time he was not much employed in this way. Henceforth he devoted more attention to fancy subjects; but his fortune was made. He had secured a position in society and among the learned at which his rivals never aimed, and he was upborne to the end of his days at the highest point of reputation in his profession.

Goldsmith died in the year 1774. Johnson was turning his pen to the defence of the government of Lord North, and was writing "Taxation no Tyranny." But the House of Assembly did not believe this; the sharp echo of rifles among the woods of Lexington was heard in England, and then the guns of Bunker's Hill; and the years of the American War passed stormily on, complicated with dangers nearer home. Paul Jones, on the northern coast, and the fleets of France in

the south, threatened and alarmed the country. Sir Joshua turned out with Garrick to visit the camps ; finding possibly that his sitters were few and his pursuits more solitary. The trial of Keppel and his acquittal, which set the town into a blaze of illumination, and drove the younger Pitt to the breaking of windows in his excitement, drew forth a letter of sympathy from Reynolds to his early friend, not now the young commodore, but the veteran admiral, of whom Burke wrote in after years so feelingly, and whose honest face was elevated to the dignity of innumerable sign-boards, long since rotted and fallen, while Sir Hugh Palisser was burnt in effigy.

Art, however, even under the frown of threatened invasion, did not stand still. The exhibition was removed from Spring Gardens to Somerset House, where it remained down to our own time. Reynolds painted a not very excellent figure of Theory sitting on a cloud, for the ceiling of the new room. Two of his finest portrait groups, those of the members of the Dilettanti Society, were done in these years ; and the designs for the great window of Oxford, afterwards rendered in glass, by Jervas—the Nativity in the centre, the Virtues in various compartments. Some of the designs for this series have been highly prized, and were sold for large sums after his death. The Nativity was bought by the young Duke of Rutland, and was unfortunately burnt with many other fine works, one of which was a full length of General Oglethorpe, of Savannah, at the great fire at Belvoir Castle. In 1780 he again visited Devonshire. He spent a little time with Keppel at Bagshot, and with Dunning at Spitchwick-on-Dartmoor, while Burke was making an unsuccessful appeal to his Bristol constituency, and awarding unmeasured praise to Dunning. Barry had enshrouded his gloomy head in the Adelphi, which he had engaged to decorate for nothing, living hardly for seven years, and earning a scanty support by etching and engraving by lamplight,—a noble instance of devotion to art. The Adelphi Exhibition was thrown open in 1783, and we find Dr. Johnson present at the private view, and delivering the dictum, “Here we see a grasp of mind that we find nowhere else.”

In 1781 Sir Joshua paid that visit to the Low Countries, the result of which appeared in his published notes—a very valuable series of criticisms on individual pictures.

His power had not declined, though he was now sixty years of age. Indeed, the study of the Flemish schools seemed to give new stimulus to his mind and hand, and to the last there *was* no decline in his power.

✱

We cannot stay to look at Reynolds' political opinions, or at the political changes from this time: the Coalition ministry, the story of "Fox's Martyrs," the general elections, where Mrs. Crewe (whose portrait as St. Geneviève among her sheep is one of Sir Joshua's masterpieces) and the Duchess of Devonshire mingled in the crowd; nor at the passion for ballooning, of which Dr. Johnson grew so tired of hearing. Over the brave and grand career of Johnson the glooms of the grave were spreading. His health had received severe shocks. Hearing of the death of Allan Ramsay, a good portrait painter, and a learned and accomplished man, all his life a friend both of Johnson and Reynolds, he writes, "Whichever way I look, mortality presents its formidable frown;" and soon the frown darkened over his own head. In patient submission and devout contemplations, fixed on those great truths of Christianity which he thought it almost profanity to defend by argument, his great voice ceased—on Monday, December 13, 1784. "Dr. Johnson dyed at 7 in the afternoon," is the entry in the pocket-book of Reynolds.

There are other events of much interest in the years that remain, but the bright circlet of stars was broken and obscured—Goldsmith, Beauclerk, Garrick, Johnson, were all gone. Sterne had vanished suddenly long before. From the flush and glare of society he had found his way through the gloom of a parish burying-ground, and the sack of a body-snatcher to the hideous resurrection of a Cambridge dissecting table. Boswell was left lamenting and maudlin; untaught by all his opportunities, and yet engaged on the best biography in the world. "We are not sure," says Macaulay, "that there is in the whole history of the human intellect so strange a phenomenon as this book. Many of the greatest men that ever lived have written biography. Boswell was one of the smallest men that ever lived, and he has beaten them all."

Reynolds was not the man to succumb to the dreary privations of age. As he lost his old friends he did not close up his affections. He had taken the poet Crabbe, in 1783, to supply the void left by the death of Goldsmith; and we find him visiting and holding friendly intercourse with a new race of amateurs and men of fashion, such as Sir George Beaumont and Sir Abraham Hume. To the years between 1784 and 1789, too, belong the largest and most ambitious of his works. The Infant Hercules, painted for the Empress Catherine of Russia, who rewarded him with a letter, a diamond snuff-box, and fifteen hundred pounds, paid to his

executors; the Death of Cardinal Beaufort, and Macbeth and the Witches, for the Boydell gallery; the Continnence of Scipio, also purchased by the Empress of Russia; and Cymon and Iphigenia, shown in the International Exhibition of 1862, and one of his finest works. He also did some of his best portraits in these few last years: John Hunter and Joshua Sharp were among the number. Two strokes of palsy had not disabled him either in mind or body. The year 1789, when he was sixty-six years old, found him more passionately in love with his palette and pencils than ever.

Miss Palmer, one of the two nieces who for many years had kept his house, writes in 1787, "He is painting from morning to night, and the truth is, that every picture he does seems better than the former." In power of execution, at any rate, this was true. The wonderful group of "Cherub-heads," in our National Gallery, was painted in 1787, and they are hardly exceeded, if they are exceeded, in magic of touch by any heads that were ever painted.

Till Monday, July 13th, 1789, he worked with untiring vigour. On that day, as he was painting the portrait of Miss Russell, "a mist and a darkness" fell over his left eye, "a dim suffusion veiled" it, and from the same cause as in the case of Milton, *gutta serena*. He paused a moment, gently laid down his pencil and his palette, and resumed them no more.

"The race is over," he writes to Sheridan six months afterwards, "whether it is won or lost." He lived till the 23rd of February, 1792. He was often low-spirited, from fear of utter blindness, but this did not come upon him. He rambled to various scenes in quest of change and health. He amused himself for a while with a canary that used to perch on his hand and sing to him, but it proved faithless and flew away. He wandered about Leicester Square after it for hours, but did not find it. Ozias Humphry, the painter, used to drop in and read the paper to him, and he now and then retouched and arranged his pictures, or slowly prepared his final Discourse. This, the fifteenth, was delivered on the 10th of December, 1790:—"Sir Joshua had a crowded audience, and while he was speaking, a sudden crash was heard, and the floor of the room seemed to be giving way. The company rushed towards the door in the utmost alarm and confusion. Sir Joshua was silent, and did not move from his seat, and after some little time the company perceiving that the danger had ceased, most of them resumed their places, and he continued his discourse as calmly as if nothing had occurred. It was

afterwards found that one of the beams which supported the floor had given way. Sir Joshua remarked to Northcote, that if the floor had really fallen most of the persons assembled must have been crushed to death, and the arts in this country would have been thrown two hundred years back."

The latter part of this memorable discourse consists of a eulogium on Michael Angelo:—its last passage—"I reflect, not without vanity, that these discourses bear testimony of my admiration of that truly divine man, and I should desire that the last words I should pronounce in this Academy, and from this place, might be the name of MICHAEL ANGELO."

"As Reynolds descended from the chair, Burke stepped forward, and taking his hand, held it while he addressed him in the words of Milton:—

"The angel ended, and in Adam's ear
So charming left his voice, that he awhile
Thought him still speaking, still stood fixed to hear."

"This I heard from Mr. Rogers, who said, 'Nobody but Burke could have done such a thing, without its appearing formal or theatrical.' But from him it seemed spontaneous and irresistible. Such a tribute from such a man, formed a fitting close for the life's work of Reynolds."

The disease of which Sir Joshua died was an affection of the liver, and this led to "a distressing depression of the spirits, which his physicians ascribed to hypochondria." (Boswell in a melancholy letter to his friend Temple, dated November 22, 1791, says: "My spirits have been still more sunk by seeing Sir Joshua Reynolds almost as low as myself. He has for more than two months past had a pain in his blind eye, the effect of which has been to occasion a weakness in the other, and he broods over the dismal apprehension of becoming quite blind. He has been kept so low as to diet, that he is quite relaxed and desponding. He who used to be looked upon as perhaps the most happy man in the world, is now as I tell you.")

Miss Burney, just released from the honours of court life and the talons of Madame Schwellenberg, called to see him. "He wore a bandage over one eye, and the other shaded with a green half-bonnet. He seemed serious even to sadness, though extremely kind. 'I am very glad,' he said, in a meek voice and dejected accent, 'to see you again, and I wish I could see you better, but I have but one eye now and scarcely that.'"

He bore patiently his last affliction, and died as sincerely regretted as any man of his time. While he lay dying, the political horizon was dark and troubled, like one of those wild backgrounds which we see in his portraits of warriors. The first hot blasts of the French Revolution had blown, but he did not live to see the final bursting of the storm. The next morning, in the house where Sir Joshua lay, Edmund Burke wrote the following obituary notice, which we cannot refrain from quoting at length.

"Last night, in the 69th year of his age, died, at his house in Leicester-fields, Sir Joshua Reynolds. His illness was long, but borne with a mild and cheerful fortitude, without the least mixture of anything irritable or querulous, agreeably to the placid and even tenor of his whole life. He had from the beginning of his malady, a distinct view of his dissolution, and he contemplated it with that entire composure, which nothing but the innocence, integrity, and usefulness of his life, and an unaffected submission to the will of Providence could bestow. In this situation he had every consolation from family tenderness, which his own kindness had indeed well deserved.

"Sir Joshua Reynolds was, on very many accounts, one of the most memorable men of his time. He was the first Englishman who added the praise of the elegant arts to the other glories of his country. In taste, in grace, in facility, in happy invention, and in the richness and harmony of colouring, he was equal to the great masters of the renowned ages. In portrait he went beyond them; for he communicated to that description of the art, in which English artists are the most engaged, a variety, a fancy, and a dignity derived from the higher branches, which even those who professed them in a superior manner did not always preserve when they delineated individual nature. His portraits remind the spectator of the invention of history, and the amenity of landscape. In painting portraits he appeared not to be raised upon that platform, but to descend to it from a higher sphere. His paintings illustrate his lessons, and his lessons seem to be derived from his paintings.

"He possessed the theory as perfectly as the practice of his art. To be such a painter, he was a profound and penetrating philosopher.

"In full affluence of foreign and domestic fame, admired by the expert in art and by the learned in science, courted by the great, caressed by sovereign powers, and celebrated by distinguished poets, his native humility, modesty, and candour, never forsook him even on surprise or provocation, nor was the least degree of arrogance or assumption visible to the most scrutinizing eye in any part of his conduct or discourse.

"His talents of every kind, powerful from nature, and not meanly cultivated by letters, his social virtues in all the relations and all the habitudes of life, rendered him the centre of a very great and unparalleled variety of agreeable societies, which will be dissipated by his

death. He had too much merit not to excite some jealousy; too much innocence to provoke any enmity. The loss of no man of his time can be felt with more sincere, general and unmixed sorrow.

"HAIL! AND FAREWELL!"

His body lay in state at the Royal Academy, and was followed to the grave by a concourse such as had rarely been seen before on such an occasion. The Dukes of Portland, Dorset, and Leeds, the Marquises of Townshend and Aberdeen, the Earls of Carlisle, Inchiquin, and Upper Ossory, Lord Palmerston, and Lord Elliot, bore his pall; and perhaps in the long list of mourners there has seldom been in a state funeral so many who would really mourn. So lived, so died, so in "this kind of observance," was honoured the first renowned British artist—and one of the great artists of the world—standing in the front rank along with Titian, and Vandyke, and Rembrandt.

The contemplation of Reynolds' portraits is one of the enjoyments of every highly cultivated Englishman. There is in them a calm dignity, a bright life, a bewitching grace.

Mr. Taylor seems to be much impressed with the "momentary" character of Reynolds' portraits. What rapidity of eye, what accuracy of impression, what spirit and sparkle of taste do we see in them. Garrick with his thumbs pressed together, and his conversational pertinence of look. Hunter with his drooping pen and far wandering eye,

"Voyaging through strange seas of thought alone."

Banks with his instinctive restless desire to rise from his chair and explore the earth to its utmost horizons. And this *zest* runs through so many of his portraits. How he got such endless variety is a continual wonder. "Hang it, how *various* he is!" said Gainsborough, as he paced the exhibition rooms. We know of our "portrait of a gentleman;" our corporation pictures; our too-dazzling Lord Mayors, before we see them; the hot, encumbered appurtenances, the Boswellian strut. But Reynolds' men, though boiling over with action and motion, never strut. Their legs are not always well drawn, but they do not stand at ridiculous angles. If he stole all these vivacious attitudes, he was at least a most accomplished thief,—"*Convey* the wise it call." This rapid and consummate taste, this instinctive avoidance of "the weak side of things," this instant power of knowing when the right thing was before him, singles out Reynolds from all others.

See with what light and gallant spirit, yet with how little of the "bounce" of the modern "portrait of a gentleman," the Marquis of Hastings stands with his finger on his chin. See, in one of the ordinary run of his portraits, with what inquisitive ease John Gawler, Esquire, looks out of the kit-cat canvas; with what negligent grace Captain Pownall leans on his anchor-fluke. How elegantly Lady Sondes sits on her garden seat, attractive and not a dowdy in spite of the black and white machinery on her head, that at first glance make us somehow think irresistibly of earthquakes and tornadoes. And what for sumptuous naturalness and winning homeliness can exceed the long stately picture of Mrs. Wynne, and the children wrestling in each other's embraces. His intense sense of life broke in among the preposterous costumes of his time. "Never mind," said he, "they have all light and shade." And even with such head-dresses, hat and feather, frizzy locks and fly-away ribbons, as we see in the portrait of Lady Lade, life triumphs, and constructions, puzzling for their immensity and complexity, are so broken with tender clouds and breezy trees and flitting shades, that all looks agreeable and natural.

The men who are everlastingly playing at backgammon and cards in the French Exhibition, in the restored costumes of the Reynolds period, look dull, and tiresome, and heavy, if better drawn than by Reynolds. But Reynolds does not make them dull and tiresome, and it shows his power. He "always looked on his picture as a whole,"—and how wonderful are the occult relations of line, colour, and effect which go to make up a whole picture. There seem to be in them hidden powers that baffle all analysis. It is not mere mass or extent that gives sublimity. Perhaps there is no picture more solemn in general effect than the "Peter Martyr" of Titian; none which, among other elements, gives so impressive a suggestion of forest grandeur; yet it is not accomplished by representing great masses of forest scenery. Let the spectator compare the size of the trees with the size of the figures, and he will find that all the materials of the scene, with the exception of the sky and the piece of distant mountain, might be contained inside a room. The nearest tree is not thicker than the thigh of the assassin, and not more than fourteen feet high. Both trees might any day be passed in a hedgerow, with a sense of their insignificance, and the foreground is not more than ten feet wide. It is the bend, the sway, the subservience, the collocation, the mystery of relation to the human and divine interest of the scene, that

makes them what they are. Man, as seen by the painter's eye, is seen in certain compressed conditions. The men we see apart from the framings and contrivances, and limitations of art, are puzzlingly little. Across a street we can just recognise a face and figure. Seen against the great backgrounds of nature, man is nothing. The generalissimo ruling among thunder clouds, and making the mountains bow on the canvas of Reynolds, is a speck out of doors. The greatest battle seen from the hill-brow is but the waving of "thin red lines" in a smoky field. Take the man as he could be made to fit against the cloud or the rock, and his importance dwindles—he has no "relief." There was smoke and roar at Gibraltar; the roar only terrific within a league. No one saw General Elliott's head as we see it in the picture in the National Gallery, standing out, with its triangular obstinate eyebrows, against the twisting clouds and the down-pointing gun. Man has to dignify *himself*, and to the great painter who can do it for him as Reynolds could, he will willingly accord "ceremonies of bravery even in the infamy of his nature." This vast desire of man Reynolds was able to gratify. He rendered with equal perception and ease the politician in his robes of office; the mighty noble in velvet and ermine; the wit, with his jest simmering on his features; the student poring over his book, with near and piercing regard, as Barette and Johnson, or looking afar with contemplative serenity like Zachary Mudge; the country gentleman with his favourite dog, enjoying the repose of a rustic seat in the shade of his ancestral beech tree, in the grey afternoon, like Sir John Lade; the *dilettante* fingering his gem or his gem-like glass of wine; the man of pleasure taking it with easy grace; the fashionable beauty pillowed in state, with her grey towers of curl and plaster and plume, or tripping under narrow trees that bend to make her bending more graceful; the actress in tragic state, like Mrs. Yates or Mrs. Siddons; in saucy surprises, like Mrs. Abington; or in the mere lazy luxury of living, like Kitty Fisher, or "my Lady O'Brien;" or, sweetest of all, the little children! It was in these that Reynolds reaches farthest into the heart. We melt before the picture of "Innocence," with her dimpled hands on her bosom. We are hushed before the infant Samuel, who yet is only a modern child, "called of the Lord"—sacred enough as such. There is a throng of these little ones peering at us from canvas and canvas, calling us back to our childhood with winning smiles and wondering eyes. In doing these his power seemed to rise

with age. Let any one look well, who has not already often looked, at those cherub heads, all done from little Lady Mary Gordon, and painted not long before "the drop serene" brought him to a final pause: praised by Leslie for its exquisite evanescent touch and pure colour, but rising far beyond all technical grace. If we search anywhere among "the figures of the true" for an illustration of the words, "for of such is the kingdom of heaven," let us see it there. It is as much sermon as art can yield, simply to bring together before the mind's eye this picture and the Kitty Fishers and Nelly O'Briens, and make no further comment.

The greatest of all Reynolds' achievements in portraiture was the portrait of Mrs. Siddons, as Tragedy, on her cloudy throne. In this instance, the strange and ugly fashion in which the hair at that period was dressed, rather aids than impedes the sentiment. The whole mass moves horrent from the brow as if standing on end; the dark eyebrows rise under it in slight corrugation, and the springs of imagination are moved. "Scaffolds, still sheets of water, divers woes," the collapse of power, the eclipse of nations, terror, and the immensity of human sorrow, pass in twilight procession as we look, and haunt us when we turn away.

On the force, and dignity, and life, and naturalness of his portraits, there was, as his most peculiar distinction, the crown of *grace*. He was, as Ruskin happily calls him, "lily-sceptred." Taken by itself, and apart from science, we might almost say that Raphael himself had no higher sense of grace. We pardon even his incorrectness in the bewitching fluency of this element in his female portraits. It reached to the disposition of a curl and the flow of a fold. That and the sense of life and motion which pervades his pictures carries us away, and does not even suffer us long to weary of his works. And it was just that exquisitely balanced mixture of outward practical sense and spirit, with the amenity of a graceful soul, that made him so beloved in society, so able to please, without flattery or loss of independence. We can see for ourselves the refutation of Allan Cunningham's insinuations; he had no need of the smooth tongue of the courtier to secure his success. He had a happy mixture of wisdom and gentleness—

"Still born to improve us in every part;
His pencil our faces, his manners our heart."

Where Reynolds fell into the unhappy classic vein of his time,

it is impossible to relish many of his works; they become oppressive. Compare the dress of Mrs. Braddyl, its lively accidental "set," or the attire of the Ladies Waldegrave, in that lovely group where two are winding silk, and one is embroidering at a real table, with a drawer and a key, and think of their being exchanged for "The Graces adorning a bust of the Duchess as Magna Mater"—the Graces with great *têtes* pomatumed and powdered, the Graces in stays, the Graces without hoops, but with dresses lashed about their legs as only the wettest and thinnest muslin could cling in the wildest storms, yet doing it, defiant of law, in the profoundest calm! "What," says Uncle Toby, "has a man who believes in God to do with these things?" Let the Graces wander in Ionia as Praxiteles saw them, and teach what they could to a world that "by wisdom knew not God." Our great-grandmothers, playing at Graces, and cooking sacrifices to perished divinities, "swearing by the sin of Samaria, and saying, Thy god, O Dan, liveth, and the manner of Beersheba liveth," were too much for even Reynolds to render tolerable to a Christian age. One of the best of these we can examine at our leisure in the National Gallery. Three celebrated beauties are "adorning the altar of Hymen," but, O that they had been winding silk, or shooting at targets, or even, as it is said, one fine lady who sat to him did, "eating beefsteaks and playing at cricket on the Steyne, at Brighton!"

Burke says that Reynolds seemed to descend to portraiture from a higher sphere. It was from the mount of philosophy that he descended, and not from "the highest heaven of invention." There was one thing he had not,—the perception of the unseen, of the something beyond. "Great and graceful as he paints," he is "a man of the earth," seeing, it is true, all that is noblest and best on "this visible diurnal sphere," but never quitting it. In one instance—the portrait of Mrs. Siddons—we just feel the inflation of the balloon. It strains, and rocks, but it does not leave the ground. It was Mrs. Siddons more than Sir Joshua who gave the spiritual element to it. Other men of his time had the gift. Fuseli had it. In spite of Horace Walpole, with his lace ruffles and his two strokes of catalogue-disdain, Fuseli "makes us feel the Gothic thrill at ghostly evanescence, the grey gliding mysteries of Hercynian forests, the stalk of mailed phantoms—

"By thy wild and stormy steep,
Elsinore."

If he saw no gods descend from heaven, he saw them in the caverns of Endor "rising out of the earth." If he could not soar and blaze with Uriel, he could sink by thought into the profound of Hades, and see the cloudy gates of Chaos and the pit, and the key that was "forged by no earthly smith." We feel his spell creeping in the roots of the hair. "Nature put him out," but he *saw* what he tried to paint if he could not perfectly paint all that he saw.

And Romney, too, had the great gift. But it was the Greek gift, and not the Scandinavian. He beheld the Oread on her mountain heath, the Naiad by her ferny wells, the wild prevision of Cassandra, the stony horror of Œdipus waiting for his doom. And Gainsborough had it, but it was the true British imagination that possessed *him*. It was that swelling, glowing, heavenly-solemn faculty, that dwelt in the author of "The Seasons,"

"For ever rising with the rising mind,"

to which the cultured Englishman most readily responds, as he hears the sweep of autumnal gales in his own island, or through glades whose leafage is yellowing to the fall looks westward at his misty sunsets, exalted by the pleasing Miltonic melancholy with which he would "choose to live."

Reynolds had it *not*. He *fished* for such ideas as did not walk in the daylight. They never rose spontaneous from the deep, and the genii, caught by guile, sulk and are uneasy on his canvas. There is a touch of the terrible in the picture of Cardinal Beaufort, and we wish the anecdote of the grinning coalheaver who sat for it had been suppressed. Yet the anecdote only proves that Shakespeare himself in his awfully-minute delineation could not quicken the sterile fancy of Reynolds without the help of the coalheaver.

In the highest subjects of all, his failure was the most signal. Of the Oxford window, our only intuition is, that it is abominable in theory, in conception, in style. The lubberly angel above, the smirking faces below, the vapid rows of Virtues between the mullions, scarcely higher in invention than those blindfold white women with scales, and idiotic Hopes with anchors, which support the dignity of a "Perpetual Grand Master" of the Order of Odd Fellows, on his engraved diploma,—are all bad together. It is a wonder that Reynolds should be so anxious to have his name "hitched in" in connection with so aimless, tasteless, and absurd an attempt. There were ten pictures under the

great historie "Infant Hercules," "some better, some worse," he said, and there is something grand about the work, but not enough to kindle the mind. The "Macbeth" was a curious *réchauffé* of Verrio, Michael Angelo, and Sir Joshua Reynolds. Many of his purely *fancy* pictures are charming—his Shepherd Boys, Cupids in Disguise, Muscipulas, Strawberry Girls, Contemplative Boys, Fortune Tellers. Whatever he could reach by vision and taste he could do, but the gates of imagination were closed and sealed to him. It was his calling to pourtray, and the allowance of his gifts was large enough.

The chief praise which Mr. Taylor awards to Reynolds' writings on art is, that "their tendency is upwards." He had a strong conviction of the high claims of art on the attention of thinking men, and does not so much enforce this as assume it. This is, after all, one of the chief uses of the pen in the region of art. The medium of pictorial art is not *words*. It would be possible to render the most exact account in words of what a picture ought to be, without having the least perception of what it is, or the least power to judge it aright. The most valuable practical utterances are the simple dicta of great painters as to the relative status and qualities of pictures. The moment verbal analysis is attempted, the utter poverty of language in *that* sphere is made apparent. The finest criticisms are mere finger-posts to mark the road on which they do not travel. Where a painter takes the pen, however, he is amenable to the pen. Reynolds was a pioneer in the direction of statements on art. The laws which govern art—and here is one of its charms to those who pursue it—are those common to all the great pursuits of life. "So close," writes Erskine, "is the analogy between all the operations of genius, that your Discourse is the best dissertation upon the art of public eloquence that ever was or ever will be written." But, when these laws are discovered and laid down, the materials amongst which they work, the phenomena of aspect, line, form, colour, light, shade, effect, have all to be learnt and understood before a man can become a good critic of painting; and the full meaning of Reynolds' discourses, inaccurate as they may be in some of their reasonings, may be misunderstood if the painter and the literary critic do not intend the same thing. The true painter reasons with his brush, and can afford but little leisure to help forward that correct statement of the functions and laws of art which, in a verbal form, enter little into his meditations, but which yet are so much to be desired as a

common platform between the artist and the man of general culture. "The eye has its own poetry," says Sir Charles Eastlake.

Reynolds' *methods* of painting were chiefly useful to our school in the way of warning. Many of his finest pictures are already blurred and blighted beyond hope of recovery. His *aims* as to colour and texture were not always satisfactory. He used wax compounds, that now and then go far to suggest Madame Tussaud or Mrs. Jarley, in their confectionary surface. It was his practice to lay in the likeness, in what is called "dead colour," with little more than black and white: over this, when dry, he passed transparent varnishes and mixtures, charged with the tints required to complete the colour. These colours,—carmines, lakes, and other vegetable hues,—were often fleeting. They "sparkled and exhaled" under the power of sunshine. Sometimes the varnish would turn brown or green, and ruin the complexion. Sometimes a thick-headed cleaner would fetch it all off, and find the *caput mortuum* below. A still more fatal practice was to lay one coat on another, with materials that had no blood relation-ship, and then there were constant feuds and insurrections among the pigments, and the picture was rent asunder. "Oh, heavens! Murder! Murder!" says the ranting Haydon, as he spells out the comical occult recipes, partly broken English and partly Italian, in which Sir Joshua recorded these experiments. "Murder!—it would crack under the brush!" His pictures have often a very special charm, arising from what Haydon calls "his glorious gemmy surface." This was in part owing to the reflex influence of his want of facility. There were ten pictures under "the Infant Hercules," and many of his best pictures, before he had done with them, had been so loaded with coat on coat of rich pigments, rough and intermingled with all the tints of the palette, that they were ready for the final and magical "surface" that enchanted Haydon. When the full idea was seized, then came the "lily-sceptred" hand, and the light brush in its graceful sweeps catching the upper surfaces of the many-coloured granules, permits the eye to see, through the liberated airy stroke, the sparkle of the buried wealth beneath. Romney struck in his forms with masterly ease at once, even at the first sitting; and if in him we miss this jewelled richness, it is abundantly compensated by the breathing sense of power which plays around his works of imagination.

Reynolds' personal character is fascinating. If we are to judge of a man's worth by the rank and style of his friends,

what shall we say of the man who secured such invariable and decided testimonials from Samuel Johnson—of him whom the author of the "Vicar of Wakefield" loved like a brother? Let us first read Burke's eulogies on Dunning and Keppel, and then reflect that Burke, Dunning, and Keppel were among Sir Joshua's most intimate friends. The terms used by all who knew him in describing his manners are all of one order. Calm, simple, unaffected, placid, genial, gentle, are words of constant occurrence on all sides in any attempt to characterise him.

In his mental organisation, the most prominent faculty pointed at by all is the power of generalisation. "To be such a painter he was a profound and penetrating philosopher." Mr. Taylor watches closely his habit of "condensing" in conversation. Then came that precious virtue of taste—the guard of his rapid observation and intense sense of character. His surprising *vitality*, which palsy could only threaten, which age could not lower, is to be very especially noticed. It was this that permitted his life, "so full of labour that tongue cannot utter it." His fruitfulness was not less than *prodigious*.

We may pry too curiously into the *moral* of a life, but no truly thoughtful person can omit all consideration of it from his final judgment. This consideration is especially provoked when the subject of it has been eminently fortunate and happy, and it is invited in the case of Sir Joshua Reynolds, by the generalised conception he entertained of life as a *whole*. Did *all* the elements of calculation enter into his arrangement of "the great game he had to play?" He was convicted of nothing usually accounted a vice. In manners, in temper, he was all that could be wished or expected. He was,—Dr. Johnson said—"invulnerable" as a member of civil society. He had respect for religion, as appears in various incidental ways. We are not informed if he were a church-goer. We are told that he painted on Sunday, and that Johnson urged him to abandon the practice. His sister, Mrs. Palmer, was much concerned, and expostulated with him on the same subject. Johnson exhorted him to read the Bible daily, and to consider his latter end.

It is well that we are not called on to look to the life of a man for a standard of virtue and religion. That is found outside a man. But it is permitted to us, it is enjoined upon us, for *our own* improvement, encouragement, or warning, to judge of a man's conformity to that standard, and thus know

him by his "fruits." In the case of those individual acts, which do not clearly contradict any known moral or divine law, the moral significance is indeed as hard to ascertain as it would be to pick out and protest against those parts of Reynolds' pictures which were painted on Sunday. We look with high respect on the religious spirit of Johnson, and we see him occasionally doing pretty much the same things that Reynolds did. At the theatre, the masquerade, at Ranelagh, at Vauxhall, in the company of wits and men of fashion, we find him by the side of Reynolds. We have much information as to the creed and religious habits of Johnson. We have none as to those of Sir Joshua, and we can only *ponder*.

ART. V.—*The Book of Prophecy: comprising a Proof of the Plenary Inspiration of Holy Scripture; a Classified Arrangement of Prophecies already fulfilled, or in course of fulfilment; and Prophecy as the "Testimony of Jesus," considered in its relation to the Faith of the Church and the Progress of Scepticism.* By GEORGE SMITH, LL.D., F.A.S. London: Longmans. 1865.

THE author of "The Religion of Ancient Britain," of the triple series of "Sacred Annals," and of our most extended and trustworthy "History of Wesleyan Methodism," is a name familiar to the Christian world of both hemispheres, and one which wins honour wherever it travels. The piety, the conscientious research, and the manly sense, by which the writings of Dr. Smith are characterised, have secured for him a reputation, such as he could ill afford to exchange for any credit gained by subtlety or brilliance, in the absence of these nobler qualities of the man of letters. And we need hardly assure the readers of Dr. Smith's previous books, that, in the respects of which we have now spoken, the present work is every way worthy of its predecessors. While careful to avoid ballooning, Dr. Smith does not shrink, as occasion seems to offer, from a little honest speculation on his topics: the full and minute inquiry, in which he delights, is seen to advantage at more than one leading step in his argument: and the strong religious conviction and feeling, which pervade the entire composition, will command respect, even from those who may be disposed to scruple the firmness of some of the writer's literary positions, or the force and conclusiveness of his earnest logic.

Dr. Smith's title-page, apart from his preface, suggests the general reasons which led him to prepare and publish the work before us. Like many other thoughtful Christian men of his time, Dr. Smith has felt his moral indignation aroused by the attitude which contemporary scholarship and science are holding towards the great verities of Christianity and religion. The boldness with which it is assumed, that we of the current age are the wise, and that all mankind before us were fools; the grotesque self-satisfaction with which a number of intellectual weaklings affect to twist round their fingers the great moral and spiritual problems of the universe; the superb pertness and nonchalance with which the Bible is

thrust into the rag-bag of old wives' fables, because it will not answer on the instant to every sciolist in physics or antiquities who chooses to put it through its catechism: these and kindred phenomena of the world of modern European sentiment and inquiry have filled our author with amazement and just alarm; and under the influence of these feelings, he has girded himself to the task of defending the ancient truth, and of furnishing the younger thinkers of his generation, in particular, with arms of offence and defence against the mole-eyed, but headstrong and intolerant scepticism, which threatens to carry them away.

Before proceeding to the special subject of his book, Dr. Smith devotes a few preliminary chapters to the larger question of the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures in general; and though here he breaks no new ground, the old, irrefragable argument is reproduced with a sobriety, clearness, and prevalent strength of reasoning, which, it could be wished, the opponents would condescend to imitate. No doubt, it is rather antiquated for a writer of the present day to labour to show, that man needs a revelation from God beyond that of his "consciousness," and his sensible relations to the *cosmos*; that the Bible of both Testaments purports and professes to be such a revelation; that as matter of demonstrable historic fact—demonstrable, so far as any historic fact can be—the several parts of the Bible, even the oldest of them, were recognised by a long, unbroken chain of prophets, including One greater than all prophets, as Divine productions, the said chain of witnesses reaching from one end of the chronology of the composition of the sacred books to the other; and that while the volume, which comes to us with these credentials of a supernatural origin and character, is absolutely unique as a literature, its contents are such as can only be explained on the principle, that God is the author of it. No doubt all this savours of the past, and has been said, in one form or other, often well and ably said, a thousand times before. Still it is that which the nature of the case requires to be said; it is what has never yet been answered by any higher logic than ridicule, or "cries of question:" and as Dr. Smith has put it, it cannot fail to be of service to that large class of readers, whose means or leisure restricts them, in the study of great religious or literary topics, to a few authorities, not difficult of access, and easy to be understood.

We cannot pledge ourselves, that all the views expressed by Dr. Smith, in this opening section of his work, will pass without challenge, even from those who are thoroughly satis-

fied with his argument as a whole. When in dealing, for example, with the supernatural elements in the history of the progenitor of Israel, he asks, "What, save a supernatural and religious motive, can be assigned for Abraham leaving Mesopotamia, to be a wanderer through a strange country for his whole life?"—we do no injustice to the forces which actually determined the patriarch's conduct, if we say that, all other considerations apart, it is by no means past conceiving, that such a migration and life-exile might be due to causes of quite a different order from those, which we know to be the explanation of them. So we can very well imaginé a friendly critic to raise questions of interpretation and language, which Dr. Smith would find it hard to meet, over the use which he makes of the passages in the eleventh of Hebrews, referring to the sacrifice of Abel and to Enoch's walk with God; both the scope and the Greek, it might be urged, making the "witness" there spoken of, to be that of Old Testament Scripture, and not, directly and chiefly, that of God testifying to the patriarchs themselves His acceptance and approval of them. In a few other places, likewise, we have noted assumptions or reasonings, against which most readers of Dr. Smith's book will be disposed, we think, to put notes of interrogation in the margin of their copies.

On the whole, however, our author's treatment of the great preliminary question of inspiration, and of the nature of prophecy as following from it, is one of the best parts of his work. In the nature of things, he cannot go much into detail in arguing the Mosaic date of the Mosaic writings and institute,—which is one important stage of his inquiry;—but his induction, so far as it reaches, is sound and unanswerable: and with the wonderful series of facts, to which the instances he selects may serve as index, before the mind, it becomes a curious question of psychical and ethical pathology, how any difficulties of grammar, archæology, or other subordinate departments of evidence can make it for a moment dubious, whether the Pentateuch, as we now have it, was, in all that constitutes its identity, the veritable production of the great legislator. Whatever confidence Dr. Smith may feel in his apology and polemic on this subject, will be endorsed by every one with whom it is not a foregone conclusion that Moses was not the writer of his own books.

The clear-mindedness and courage displayed by Dr. Smith in his discussion of the supernatural character of the Bible, are a feature only too seldom marking the kind of literature of which his book is an example. The "rationalising" in-

terpreters of Scripture, so called, not unfrequently throw a sop to the so-called "orthodox," by alleging, that the surrender of such portions of the sacred volume as come into conflict with modern science involves no trespass upon its Divine prerogative, inasmuch as its authors speak the language of the multitude, and ought not therefore to be held responsible for all that is implied in the letter of their statements. This allegation, sometimes made in guile, quite as often in weakness, has been accepted, in a multitude of instances, by those whom it is intended to comfort or cajole, as a doctrine which precisely meets the controversial emergency; and they have used it, accordingly, without fear or misgiving. Dr. Smith is not caught in the trap of so obvious a sophism. It is perfectly true, that the biblical writers employ the phraseology of every-day life in treating of historical, antiquarian, and scientific subjects. They do this habitually. It would be a portent, a violation of the very genius of Scripture, if they did not. And only wilful religious scepticism or hopelessly wooden ignorance will find any difficulty on this ground. But this is not the whole of the case. The inspired authors *teach dogmatically* what science, as such, doubts or denies. Here is the gist of the question. It is one thing for a writer, claiming to be the bearer of Divine oracles, to speak of the sun going forth from the end of the heaven, or of the pillars on which God has reared the fabric of the earth. It is quite another thing—and the "orthodox" should be as keenly alive to this, as any of their opponents—for such a writer to affirm that the world was made in a week, or that all men but eight were once destroyed by a flood, or that Methuselah lived nearly a thousand years. Statements of the former class need no vindication with men of right feeling, and of ordinary common sense; and they create no real embarrassment. But it is otherwise with statements of the latter description. Some of these distinctly antagonise the presumed facts of history, or the most approved principles and conclusions of inductive science; and the difficulty which they raise is by no means to be got rid of by saying that the language of the Bible is popular, and must be explained accordingly. Dr. Smith accepts the difficulty in its whole dimensions. He not only allows that the contents of the Bible are often of a kind to stumble the disciple of science. He maintains this as a prime fact of his argument. The Scriptures throughout, he contends, assume and teach the supernatural; and this is one great mark and proof of their divinity. They profess to be a revelation from God; and in

harmony with their profession, they inform us of much which the unaided thought of man could never have discovered for itself, or which, if it dealt with it at all, it would surely misinterpret. Such is Dr. Smith's position ; and it is the right one. It is worse than idle to gloze over the fact that the Bible on the one hand, and a rigorous inductive philosophy, intolerant of miracle, on the other, are sometimes at issue, by reminding us, that the writers of Scripture, inspired as they were, did not speak the language of science, and therefore are not accountable for teaching what, in the scientific view, is erroneous and false. The truth is, that all down the course of the Biblical records, events are represented as occurring, as to which a science, not broad enough to admit the possible action of the supernatural at any point whatever in the history of the world, is and must be in distinct antagonism with their testimony. Let it be held demonstrated that the world is a purely natural result of the play of physical causes ; that no human being ever did or could live above a century or two ; that under all conceivable circumstances fire must burn, and water drown ; and that it is not possible for a man really dead to come to life again : we practise a fraud upon ourselves if we imagine that any scheme of harmonising will ever bring a science such as this into agreement with the Mosaic cosmogony, with Methuselah and "the three Hebrew children," with Simon Peter, and with Christ. The Bible, from end to end, as Dr. Smith distinctly sees and argues, is committed to miracle. It would not be the Bible if it were not. The miracle of the Bible is the glory and strength of it. And though there is no virtue in pushing its supernatural elements beyond their chosen limits, it is a simple sacrifice of the Divine authority of the Bible to attempt to bring its grand series of miracles under any category of merely natural causation, whether simple or complex, whether of equal or higher intensity than that of which our senses at present inform us.

Dr. Smith has not been afraid to take the true ground in dealing with this question : and hence we are not surprised to find him expressing impatience at the quasi-scientific explanations, which professed believers in the Bible have sometimes attempted, of certain facts belonging to the strictly miraculous cycle of its contents. We heartily sympathise with this impatience. The uncouth and ragged theories which men have pieced together, for the purpose of explaining on natural principles the fall of the manna in the desert, the standing still of the sun under Joshua, the destruction of

Sennacherib's army, and the like, have been among the most serious stumbling blocks which an ill-judging loyalty to the Bible has ever thrown in the way of those whom it hoped either to establish or win; and it is impossible to reprobate too strongly the fatuity which indulges in such theories. Science, in the presence of miracle, is impertinence and profanity. The question of the inspiration of the Bible is fair and rational: but to admit its inspiration, and then to seek to read out into the language of human physics the mystery of facts that Scripture expressly declares to be beyond the range of the physical, is an absurdity, against which all sound theology and all true science ought to make joint and earnest protest.

In treating of the nature and character of the inspiration of the Bible, Dr. Smith is perhaps wise in holding back from attempts at precise definition. Some of his readers may be disposed to wish that he had ventured further, or at least, that he had given himself more ample scope over a topic entering so vitally into the plan and aim of his book. Where so many have spoken rashly, however, it is not strange if cautious thinkers should incline to silence: and in regard to what inspiration is in itself, and to the extent in which it affected the writers of the sacred volume, Dr. Smith would seem to be only consistent with himself in declining to define. If inspiration be miraculous, it transcends all thought, and therefore all language, and should be accepted as a fact belonging to the same sphere of mystery as creation, redemption, and the other great miracles of the Scripture revelation. On the subject of degrees of inspiration, and on the relations of the Divine and human elements in the Bible, Dr. Smith does not speak at large: but so far as his sentiments find expression, they commend themselves by their agreement with the phenomena to which they refer, and by the soundness and sobriety of the critical principles which usually guide the author's judgment.

The "First Part" of the work—the part to which our observations thus far have been mainly directed—closes with sections devoted to the general subject of the "Origin, Progress, and History of Prophecy," and of the "Scriptural Prophecies concerning the Messiah." Here Dr. Smith strikes into the heart of his theme; and the remaining four or five hundred pages of his book are entirely occupied with it. "All the communications which, according to Scripture, were made (by God) to mankind in the earliest period of human history," were "predictive" in their character. The

charge forbidding the tree of knowledge was linked with prophecy. The Divine sentences pronounced at the Fall were all prophetic. "Prophecy was the basis of the piety of Abel." The doom of Cain was "full of prophecy." So the names of Enóch and of Noah are bound up for all time with prophecies, which God gave to them, or which they delivered in the name of God. The whole antediluvian period of the world, Dr. Smith argues, places us "in immediate contact with a grand series of Divine predictions." In like manner "the early religion of mankind, and their history in primitive times, stand inseparably associated with Divine prophecies, which became the foundation of permanent, popular belief." Here the author points to "the prediction of man's redemption through the intervention of a suffering Saviour, in connexion with the rite of animal sacrifice," and to the fact that all the great nations of antiquity—Egyptians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, Romans—believed in prophecy as a Divine endowment bestowed upon "men specially favoured by the gods." This belief of the nations, Dr. Smith contends, had its origin in the primeval communications made by God to man, and in the perpetuation among them, in various kinds and degrees, of the prophetic gift. He instances the case of Balaam as illustrating this general principle, and dwells in detail upon the circumstances under which "the son of Beor" delivered the remarkable oracles recorded in the Book of Numbers. From the prophet of Mesopotamia, Dr. Smith passes to Moses and the Mosaic institute, showing, by appeal to the history, how the Exode and wilderness-life of Israel were connected throughout with prophecy: how prophecy, in fact, became "a distinct and permanent" element of the Israelitish theocracy; and how, from the days of the Judges down to the close of the Old Testament canon, the sacred books abound with proof and illustration of the action of "the spirit of prophecy" in shaping, regulating, and controlling the affairs of the elect nation in all its changes.

In connexion with the case of Balaam, Dr. Smith adverts to a subject which he has discussed at large in some others of his works—the sacred places, that is to say, and sacred emblems, by which certain ancient Gentile tribes and families, named in the earlier books of Scripture, are supposed to have represented "the cherubim and the infolding fire in Paradise," and of which they are thought to have availed themselves "for the purposes of worship and intercourse with God until after the establishment of the Mosaic economy." We fear the author's speculations—always ingenious and

devout—in this very shadowy realm of primeval religious life will hardly carry the same conviction to the minds of his readers which they have for his own. At least, we could desire that Dr. Smith, in the interest of his present argument, had left a few points open, which his language, if we rightly understand him, appears to foreclose. It is speaking strongly to say, “the idea of a sword of fire guarding the entrance of Paradise, which seems countenanced by the authorized version of Gen. iii. 24, is altogether erroneous.” And when he adds, “a more correct rendering is, *And He drove out the man, and tabernacled the cherubim, and the flame of wrath which turned itself before the garden of Eden, to keep the way of the tree of life,*” an amendment of the English *Receptus* is proposed, which we certainly should not like to read up as the sense of the Hebrew, with Lightfoot or Gesenius looking over our shoulder. So elsewhere, when Dr. Smith explains the words of Laban to Jacob (Gen. xxx. 27), “I have learned by experience that the Lord hath blessed me for thy sake,” as “clearly indicating,” by the form of the original, “that this knowledge had been obtained in his place of worship before these bright or burnished symbols [the teraphim] which were regarded as essential to the oracle,” we cannot but think that the doubtful is lifted into the place of the certain, and that encouragement is given to the spirit of question to feel itself at home, where its presence would be much less safe and tolerable.

The Old Testament prophecies of Christ are justly regarded by Dr. Smith as of themselves demonstrative of the inspiration of the Bible; and in the final section of his “First Part” he enumerates and comments upon the chief of these prophecies, and exhibits in brief their bearing upon the scope of his argument. The Messianic predictions of Isaiah, Micah, and Daniel, in particular, as holding the highest rank in the class to which they belong, receive special attention, and are treated with considerable copiousness of remark and exposition. On the subject of the Messianic interpretation of prophecy in general, it is refreshing to hear Dr. Smith speak without timidity or obliqueness. It “is not,” he says, “a conceit of modern times, nor a notion derived from the fathers—it is an integral part of the teaching of Holy Scripture. To deny that the prophets wrote of Christ, and spoke of His humiliation, sufferings, and death, is not merely to resist all the evidence of the Old Testament, explained on the principles of sound criticism and common sense; but it is to reject the plain and often-repeated testimony of Christ and

His apostles, and to tear away from the inspired record a very important portion of that testimony which the Holy Spirit bears to the passion of God's Messiah." We could have borne even stronger and more sharply-pronounced language than this from our author. No man ever denied the Messianic element in Old Testament prophecy, who believed either in Christ, or in the supernatural inspiration of the Bible. Whether the prophets understood or did not understand the meaning of their own utterances, to affirm that the Spirit of God did not speak through them, and that, in speaking through them, He did not distinctly and intentionally foreshow the Christ of the New Testament, is simply to repudiate the Author of Christianity and the whole Christian system. And the present generation of believers in the Gospel must be as dull-witted as their opponents give them credit for being, if they do not perceive, that the attempts now making to reduce to a minimum the Messianic value of the Old Testament, are the offspring of a conscious or unconscious scepticism, and lead by inevitable consequence to the denial of all revelation and supernatural agency whatever.

The Second Part of Dr. Smith's volume—by far the largest of the three—is taken up, as his title-page intimates, with an explanatory and argumentative catalogue of prophecies already fulfilled or in course of fulfilment, the whole being resolved into groups, and the predictions falling within each group being commonly treated under an alphabetical system of arrangement.

The author's first group comprises those "prophetic names," which Scripture represents as given to certain individuals on account of some office, work, or event, in connexion with them; and especially such as were assigned to persons before their birth by direct Divine appointment. Adam called his wife Eve, because she would be mother of all living, or, as Dr. Smith explains, "because she was to be the mother of that *Living One*, who was destined to give life to the world." Abram became Abraham, when God formally ordained him a "father of many nations;" and for a like reason the name Sarah was substituted for the older Sarai. Ishmael, Isaac, Solomon, Cyrus, Josiah, John (the Baptist) and Jesus, are names of Dr. Smith's second class: and he dwells upon them with the fulness and detail of discussion which their importance demands.

The group which follows "embraces, in the alphabetical order of the persons named, those predictions which relate to individuals, whether referring to their own character, con-

duct, or destiny, or including matters affecting their posterity; no distinction [being made] between those prophecies whose fulfilment is recorded in . . . Scripture, and those which have been verified by the events of secular history." Here the author ranges, of necessity, over a wide and varied field. The vastness of Abraham's posterity; the deaths of Ahab, Ahaziah, and Baasha; the character of the Ishmaelites; the lengthening, by fifteen years, of the life of Hezekiah; the Divine plague upon Jehoram; the madness of Nebuchadnezzar; the judgment of God upon the Pharaoh of the Exode; the arrest of St. Paul and his deportation to Rome; the defeat of Saul and his army by the Philistines; the miscarriage of the expedition of Sennacherib; and the end of Zedekiah:—these are little more than the gleanings of a large harvest of facts, which, as Dr. Smith shows, are exhibited in the Old Testament as subjects of prophecy, and which he collects and uses for the purposes of his argument.

"Prophecies respecting tribes, peoples, and nations," constitute Dr. Smith's third group: and, pursuing the same alphabetical method as before, he causes Amalekites, Ammonites, Assyrians, Babylonians, Damascenes, Edomites, Egyptians, Gomorrhites, Kenites, Macedonians, Moabites, Persians, Phœnicians, Romans, and others, to pass successively under the eye of his reader; and in connexion with each, he shows how the prophetic oracles respecting them, delivered in the Old Testament, were sooner or later fulfilled, in the wonderful providence of God, in the process of their history. The manner of this part of the book is very much like that of the well-known work of Dr. Keith; but the researches of our author, though they reach substantially the same results, are not a mere reproduction of any one of his predecessors: and the references to Grote, Rawlinson, and other recent authorities, scattered through his pages, supply proof, not only of his desire to strengthen his argument to the uttermost, but also of his readiness to modify, if needs be, by the light of the latest and most scientific inquiry, whatever may have been unintentionally misstated, or overstated, by foregoing writers on the subject.

Dr. Smith's fourth group includes the prophecies which relate to "the Hebrew people:" namely, those delivered prior to the Exodus, those pronounced by Jacob and Moses shortly before their death, the predictions of the Wilderness-period, and of the ages between the crossing of the Jordan and the Babylonish captivity, together with prophecies of various epochs, foretelling the overthrow of Judah and Jerusalem,

"the return of the Hebrews from captivity and their restoration to political existence in their own land," the subsequent utter destruction of the Holy City, and the fate of the Jews "after this final ruin of their nation and capital." Under these several heads the writer follows in the wake of his previous discussions, stating in full, as before, the terms of the prophetic passages, exhibiting the historic facts which answer to them, and working the whole into a fabric of simple and unostentatious argument, such as scepticism might choose to sneer at, but could never tear to pieces. In a note he refers to the attacks of German unbelief on the authenticity of the latter part of the Book of the Prophet Isaiah, and maintains, with reason, that the doctrine which finds in it the work of a later hand, "involves far greater difficulties than those which the hypothesis is invoked to remove." Elsewhere he speaks more strongly of the incredible sophistry and bungling, which have yoked themselves in the attempt to get rid of this precious section of prophetic Scripture. We are glad that he does so speak. We sympathise both with his view and with his manner of expressing it. When men lay rude hands on sacred things, they deserve, and must expect, to be dealt with as profane. The contemporary Biblical scepticism reaches the meridian of its assurance, in claiming, as it does, that believers in the Bible and the Gospel shall stand quietly by, and witness its feats of scientific anatomy, with the same passionless placidity as though the subject were a mummy from Peru or Egypt.

The "prophecies concerning the Messiah" naturally fall into a single group—the fifth of the series, as arranged by Dr. Smith. The author's treatment of this class of predictions does not, of course, pretend to be exhaustive; and he cautions his readers against supposing, that, in omitting passages commonly explained as Messianic, he intends to throw doubt upon the correctness of the ordinary judgment respecting them. "Several such passages," he says, "are intentionally omitted, for the sake of brevity, and because others plainly and forcibly express the same sense." In presenting his argument under this general denomination, Dr. Smith first directs attention to the prophecies "which speak generally of a Redeemer to come," next to those "which speak of this Redeemer's line of descent, and of the place and time of His coming," then to those in which certain circumstances connected with the Redeemer's advent are pointed to and portrayed, and, last of all, to those prophecies "which speak of various aspects of character which the Redeemer

would exhibit, and of the circumstances, state, and appearance, which, on His coming into the world, He would present to public observation : " an important paragraph being added to the whole, establishing and illustrating the fact, that according to the uniform testimony of Christ and His apostles, "the humiliation, sufferings, and sacrificial death" of the Redeemer "were foretold by the ancient prophets." Interspersed with the discussion of the main topics of this chapter, Dr. Smith's readers will find a number of criticisms and expositions of texts, which give variety to the argument, and add to the practical value of it for those who need to be taught—as only too many do—what is the basis upon which Christian interpreters are used to rest their Messianic application of so much of the Old Testament. Our author's opinions on some of the special points to which he addresses himself will not command universal assent ; but what he has written on the meaning of the term "Shiloh," on the great resurrection-passage in the Book of Job, on the famous *locus vexatus* of the fortieth Psalm, and on the question of New Testament quotations from the Old, will not fail to be marked by his readers as among the most noteworthy contents of this portion of his work. In the course of his remarks upon the twenty-second Psalm, Dr. Smith speaks with approval of Hengstenberg's theory of "The Ideal Person of the Righteous One," as furnishing perhaps the best solution yet offered of the difficulties of certain Messianic passages, both of this and other Scriptures. As Dr. Smith puts this doctrine, it is not only innocuous, but may be accepted as an approximate explanation of the phenomena to which it applies. Even in the extremest case, however—be the violence which the New Testament seems to offer to the Old ever so great—we can only endorse the hypothesis of Hengstenberg on the understanding, that the Holy Spirit, prophesying in the Old Testament, meant what He Himself, interpreting in the New, declares Himself to have meant. Dr. Smith would heartily consent to this limitation. In fact, he does, in substance, prescribe it.

The sixth group of prophecies, in our author's classification, comprehends such as "refer to Gospel times, to the successes and enemies of the Church, and to its ultimate and triumphant universality." Joel's prediction of the pouring of the Spirit upon all flesh ; the declaration in Amos, that "the tabernacle of David" should be by-and-bye set up again ; the concluding verse of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah ; Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks ; and the grand predictive cycle

in the Psalms, in Hosea, Isaiah, Zechariah, and elsewhere, describing the vast extent and consummate glory of the kingdom of Messiah; form the pivots on which this part of the writer's argument is made to turn: and there are few sections of his work through which devout and thoughtful readers will follow him with greater confidence and satisfaction. The passage from the Book of Amos is a favourite with the author; and he comments upon it with force and felicity. The apologies, into which he appears ready to break, on two or three occasions, because of the fulness of Christian meaning which he finds in certain seldom-quoted Old Testament prophecies, do credit to his modesty, but are in fact altogether superfluous. We might, perhaps, have spared a few details of interpretation here and there; but Dr. Smith's applications of his texts, as a whole, do not a whit more than justice to their value, as determined by the standard of the New Testament doctrine concerning them.

The leading Scriptures relating to what Dr. Smith regards as the triple anti-Christ—Popery, Mohammedanism, and Infidelity—constitute his seventh, eighth, and ninth prophetic groups respectively; and these, with a supplementary cluster of miscellaneous predictions, complete the author's scheme, and bring us to the close of the second and principal part of his book. In treating of anti-Christ, Dr. Smith is quite aware that he treads on difficult and sometimes debatable ground, and he is careful, therefore, to avoid the dogmatism which so many previous writers have displayed in discussing this grave question, and often uses the language of caution and hesitancy, where a mere controversialist would speed along without pause. At the same time he is strong in the belief that his central positions are impregnable; and he makes no disguise either of his faith, or of the warrants of it. We believe he is right. Particular texts and details of interpretation apart, we do not see what other explanation, consistently with the character of Scripture and the facts of history, can be possibly given of the prophecies, with which the author here deals. Considering the enormous *a priori* improbability, that three such anti-Christian powers as Popery, Mohammedanism, and Infidel Rationalism should not be pointed to by the finger of Prophetic Inspiration; considering that these three types of opposition to the Gospel—so gigantic, so manifold, so persistent, so intensely hostile—stand absolutely by themselves, without peer or rival, on the line of the Christian ages; considering, further, how various, precise, and often startling is the correspondence

which subsists between the genius and operations of these dynasties of evil, on the one hand, and the words of the two Testaments foretelling how the Church should fare to the end of all things, on the other; the conclusion seems inevitable, that, so far as "the light shining in the dark place" at present enables us to translate the prophetic oracles in terms of historic fact and moral certainty, we have here the main key to a mystery, which, in the fulness and depth of it, time alone can throw open. Where ignorance, prepossession, and lack of spiritual instinct, however, have so wide a field to range in, it is hopeless to look for unanimity; and we can only thank Dr. Smith for the intelligible, straightforward, wise, and conscientious manner in which he has handled this very delicate and perplexing topic.

In casting our eye over the extended area of the author's Second Part, it is not strange if we meet with passages which stumble us. There are such passages. The interpretation—already adverted to—given by Dr. Smith of the verse in Genesis, which represents Adam as calling his wife Eve, "because she was the mother of all living," appears to us to be more than precarious. "He called her [Eve] *Life*," says our author, "because she was to be the mother of that *Living One* who was destined to give life to the world." And he adds, "This is, undoubtedly, the correct sense of the passage." We cannot but demur to this judgment. It is quite true, as Dr. Smith states, that "this name was given to his wife by Adam for a special reason." But then the narrative distinctly informs us what this special reason was. It was "because she was the mother of all living." And how this can be taken as equivalent to "the mother of the *Living One*," the Redeemer, we do not see. At another point, speaking of the idol set up by Nebuchadnezzar on the plain of Dura, Dr. Smith employs language which, we fear, will hardly enlist the sympathies of more than a small fraction of his readers. "There can be no reasonable doubt," he writes, "that this golden image was, as represented in the Paschal Chronicle, a representation of Nebuchadnezzar himself, in the character of the promised Divine Son, who was destined to have universal dominion over the world." We could wish such a passage as this absent. It is fanciful. It is an instance of overdoing. As it appears in the Chronicle, we do not think it ought to rank much higher than a Christian myth. Surely the Book of Daniel would have given us some hint of a fact so material to the religious aim of its narratives, if it had been a fact. In like manner we could

scarcely consent to render "the arm of the Lord" in the fifty-third of Isaiah, by what Dr. Smith suggests as an amended version, "the power of the Lord;" on the ground that it is the office of a translation to reproduce as nearly as possible the language, not to expound the meaning of its original. Isaiah may mean "power;" but he says "arm:" and as the English language is able to say this also in the connexion, without any violation of its idiom, it is clearly the proper word to use, and should not be superseded. All this, however, is but a slight set-off against the solid excellencies of this division of our author's work, taken as a whole. Dr. Smith would not care to have his discussions of his topics represented as extraordinarily acute or profound. He contemplates the advantage of the serious and intelligent multitude; his words agree with his design; and no earnest student of the Scriptures will rise from his pages without a moral enlargement and stimulus, such as many more pretentious volumes are quite unable to give.

The Third Part of Dr. Smith's book is headed, "Prophecy considered as *The Testimony of Jesus* with regard to its influence on the faith of the Church and the progress of scepticism." Having shown that "inspiration and prophecy are essential characteristics of Holy Scripture," and that "a great number of prophecies" cited and explained in his Second Part, "have been circumstantially fulfilled in the events of undoubted history," Dr. Smith proceeds, "It now devolves on us to exhibit the collective influence of this prophetic character of the Bible, as a great and efficient *testimony* to the mission, work, and kingdom of Christ; and to show that the reception of this testimony lies at the foundation of the faith of the Church, and that its rejection inevitably leads to all scepticism and infidelity." In working out this thesis the author argues that "the historical character of the Bible [is] adapted to the evolution of prophecy, and to the demonstration of its fulfilment." The Bible is history: and while, as such, "it exposes itself to greater opposition and more severe tests, as to its truthfulness and accuracy, than any other form of literary composition could do," and while it has, in consequence, suffered attack from sceptical learning and science, this very feature of its contents "has contributed to its interest and efficiency as a vehicle for sacred prophecy," and "has mightily tended to prove its exact and extensive fulfilment. Moreover, prophecy, like miracle, commonly so called, is with the Bible itself, "an appointed part of Divine inspiration." As Dr. Smith has it—"The argu-

ment . . . from miracles and prophecy . . . is not an invention of modern times, or, indeed, of men of any age. It is a part of revelation itself. It is the test which God Himself appointed, and upon which He has staked the verity of revealed truth." In illustration of this principle, Dr. Smith quotes from the Pentateuch, and from others of the sacred books, particularly Isaiah, the sublime passages in which God claims to possess the exclusive power of foretelling the future, and appeals to men, whether He has not, in various Scriptures, exhibited the action of this power. It does not fall in with our author's plan to work this great mine to any considerable depth; but he opens it and shows its wealth; and it is to be hoped not a few of his readers will be attracted to follow still further the lodes of thought and investigation which he has so well indicated.

Dr. Smith's next step carries him into the centre of this part of his argument. With Rev. xix. 10 as his text, he contends that whatever collateral or subsidiary ends may have been contemplated and answered by Scripture prophecy, it was designed from the beginning "to be a witness to the world for the Christ of God;" the Divine Spirit who moved the prophets aimed at this in all His communications; the words which the prophets spoke either expressly or implicitly deliver this: this is the core and substance of all prophetic teaching, whatever its modes or envelopments. Prophecy, in the reality and life of it, is the Holy Ghost's testimony respecting the Redeemer. Taken in the full extent of their meaning, the terms are in fact convertible; for "the spirit of prophecy" is essentially "the testimony of Jesus," and "the testimony of Jesus" is only the perfect articulation and embodiment of "the spirit of prophecy." This is not precisely Dr. Smith's putting of the case, but it is the same thing in other words; and we call attention to his exposition of the great Apocalyptic passage just referred to, and to the illustrations of its import which he draws from the Old and New Testaments, as forming one of the strong points of his book, and as deserving to be pondered by all who have any faith in the Bible, and in the doctrine of supernatural revelation. The practical aspects of Dr. Smith's positions are too serious to be overlooked; and, in accordance with the avowed design of his publication, he dwells upon them. "The Church of Christ," he says, "was brought into existence, trained up to maturity, and developed into a perpetual institution in the full belief of miracles and prophecy; the primitive Church had the sacred Scriptures committed to them as the supreme standard of

truth, and the law of Christian practice; . . . the religion inculcated as essential to membership in the primitive . . . Church was eminently supernatural, and the result in every individual of direct Divine influence;" moreover, the proper personality of God, as distinguished from everything like Pantheistic ideas of the Divine Being, was "universally taught and received" among the early disciples of Christ; in other terms, "the Apostles of Christ, and their immediate followers . . . received the spirit of prophecy as the testimony of Jesus, and the Church founded by them, in its preparatory arrangements, authoritative standards of truth, and the nature and character of the religion which they inculcated, was eminently supernatural, and the immediate result of direct Divine influence." And in like manner, our author maintains, we of modern times are bound "in all simplicity and truth to receive this testimony," and in such a reception alone of the witness of Christ can we look for the discomfiture of the spirit of scepticism, and the just sway and prevalence of the truth of the Gospel.

The two brief sections with which Dr. Smith concludes his volume are devoted to certain important applications, within the region of contemporary religious faith and thought, of what he has previously argued and established. Some of the points on which he insists we have already adverted to. The sections throughout breathe a fine spirit of Christian reverence and candour; they exhibit the tender yet dignified yearning of a noble heart over the moral weakness and perversity of its generation; they abound with expressions of sentiment, which men of a well-known class will laugh at as "subjective," but which Dr. Smith and others like him "know," by a higher evidence than that of induction or consciousness, to be absolute and immutable truth; and they cannot fail to be a timely caution and directory for many of his readers in the "perilous times" amidst the seductions and hazards of which our youth are called to form their belief, and fulfil their Christian course.

Dr. Smith knows too familiarly the character of the forces against which the polemic of his book is directed, to expect that their central strength will receive much impression from a work of the kind which he has now produced. Minds which affect to believe nothing which they cannot understand; which pronounce the Noachic deluge impossible, because, if it took place, they do not see how the extinct craters of Auvergne could present their present appearance; which have unlimited confidence in Manetho's dynasties, but cannot trust Moses a hairbreadth out of their view; which demand

the same sort of evidence for the Divinity of the Bible, as for the former existence of extinct armadilloes, or for the fact of an eclipse of the sun in the days of Confucius; minds of a calibre and moral habitude such as this are not likely to be touched by arguments, which, though in part scientific and historical, suppose a certain breadth of intelligence, and, above all, right spiritual perceptions and instincts, in those to whom they are addressed. Beyond this charmed circle of sceptical weakness and self-worship, however, there is a broad margin of religious life and thought, within which our author's work is fitted to do good service in the cause of Christian faith and verity; and we can only hope that Dr. Smith's best wishes for its usefulness may be realised, and that so good a book on so momentous a theme may contribute to the furtherance of the interests on whose behalf it has been written.

ART. VI.—*An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy.* By JOHN STUART MILL. London: Longmans. 1865.

MORE than five years have passed since, at a time when Sir William Hamilton's fame was in its zenith, and his authority in this country was all but unquestioned, although in America some keen criticism of the principles and conclusions of his philosophy had already appeared, we ventured to intimate our own judgment that Sir William Hamilton's contributions to philosophy had been overrated, and that, in fact, it would be rather on the negative criticism than the positive principles or conclusions embodied in his discussions and expositions that his reputation as a philosopher would have to rest. We questioned the claim of his philosophy to be regarded as an explication of that of Reid, or to be designated the philosophy of "presentative perception," and still more to be called the "philosophy of common sense." We could not admit that "Sir William, in his philosophy, had achieved more than a partial success." "He has left the world," we said, "wiser, and with a clearer philosophical atmosphere than he found it. He has been able to dissipate some fogs and mists which darkened the region of speculation; but yet amid the obscurity which still hangs over the view, there mingles with former accumulations some Hamiltonian haze. Invaluable as a criticism—making an epoch of enlarged and exact science, so far as regards logical method—the most important results of his philosophy have nevertheless been merely negative."*

Eighteen months afterwards, in an article on the "Varieties of Realism, Ancient and Modern," we expressed our more matured judgment in greater detail, and more decisively. We went so far as to suggest that, in regard to the philosophy of Reid, it might turn out that Brown's interpretation of Reid's meaning was substantially right, and Hamilton's wholly wrong. We gave our judgment that Sir William had altogether failed "in attempting to give an articulate, precise, and scientific exposition of the theory of direct perception;" and, indeed, had fallen into absurdities parallel to those of the

* See the article on the "Limits of Religious Thought: Mansel and his Critics," in the twenty-eighth number of this Review (July, 1860).

transcendental realists of the Alexandrian School, or of the recent Teutonic development, who identify thought and being. We further pointed out that, notwithstanding all Sir William's rebukes of Brown, he has not been able to escape from the necessity of falling back upon a position, in regard to our perception of external objects, not materially different from that occupied by Brown. We showed that, even in Hamilton's own remarkable theory, in regard to our direct perception of *extension*, it is not the same thing to perceive *extension*, and to perceive *material substance*, extension being but an attribute of matter; and therefore, that, notwithstanding our perception of extension, we are still quite aloof from any *knowledge* of the object itself, the substance of which extension is an attribute. "After all, then," we concluded, "we do not know the outer world; we only believe in it. We do not know it, that is to say, any otherwise, according to Hamilton's theory, than according to the philosophy of Locke or Brown. We only know it, inasmuch as we are necessitated to believe in it. We are in this sense 'hypothetical realists,' as Hamilton brands Brown for being; we are 'cosmothetic idealists,' as Brown was; for what we know, though it may be an attribute of body, is not body, while it is a sensation or idea of the mind." This last point, as we had before shown, is a fundamental, we might almost say the fundamental, postulate in Hamilton's theory of direct perception. He maintains that extension is equally a sensation of the mind, and an attribute of matter. This is the common ground on which, according to him, mind and matter meet, or rather the common property in which they coalesce. Hamilton makes mind to be extended, and sensation to be (in effect) a property no less of matter than of mind. But apart from this special theory, of which we exhibited the incongruous and extraordinary character, what we insisted upon was, that, as has been just explained, "Hamilton's theory of perception in reality comes to the same thing as that cosmothetic idealism of Brown, on which he has accumulated such ponderous charges of absurdity."

We noted, moreover, that notwithstanding the claims he makes for his own philosophy, Sir William Hamilton, in his most critical and detailed expositions, does, in effect, deny with the strongest emphasis and with much iteration and amplification that man can possess any knowledge whatever beyond that which is given by the principle of non-contradiction; viz. that we feel what we feel, and will as we will; which, in effect, is no knowledge at all; identical propositions being incapable of constituting knowledge. We noted that he calls

our "necessary beliefs," indeed, *cognitions*, and maintains that they must be true; but yet, that he refuses to admit them to be *knowledge*. In the midst of many inconsistencies, and notwithstanding more than a few contradictions, we felt warranted in affirming it to be one of the most fundamental principles of his philosophical teaching, that we know nothing but *phenomena*; and that we know these only as *phenomena*, not as implying, inferring, or revealing anything beyond. Such a definition and limitation of knowledge we regarded as not only a denial in effect of all true knowledge, but as in itself involving a contradiction, since it is impossible to know even *phenomena* as such, without some consciousness or knowledge of ourselves as knowing. An irrational animal *feels* *phenomena*, but can hardly be said to *know* them. "These," we said at that time, "are Hamilton's inconsistencies; they arise from his endeavour to reconcile his Kantism with his allegiance to Reid. Fundamentally, however, there can be no doubt that he is more of a Kantian than of a 'natural realist' of the Reid school; and hence it is that he who dealt so severely with Brown as a heretic from the true Scottish faith in philosophy, is now himself coming to be more and more suspected of having departed from the simplicity of the Reidian faith."*

Such as these having been our views five years ago, we are certainly not prepared now to enter upon the defence of Hamilton against the criticism of Mill. On the contrary, we cannot but judge that Mill's criticism of Hamilton's philosophy is almost throughout unanswerable. Never was a critical examination more thorough or more able; seldom, we think, can there have been one more entirely decisive. From Mill himself we shall have to differ yet more gravely, because still more fundamentally, than from Hamilton. We shall not find in his speculations any such amount of inconsistency, such recurring and complicated contradictions, as he points out in Hamilton's writings; but we shall find, as we apprehend, principles destructive of all certainty, whether in regard to the intellect, to morals, or to religious faith and worship. No well-informed philosophical student can read this volume without feeling that he is dealing with the speculations of a modern Hume, more cautious, more disciplined, more learned, than the Scottish sceptic, possessing, indeed, the full advantage of the hundred years which have been added to the world's culture since the days of Hume, but

* See No. XXX. pp. 613—615 and 590, 591 (January, 1861).

scarcely less thorough or consuming in his scepticism, and whose philosophy, as it is founded on principles substantially equivalent, leads directly to the like destructive results.

Mr. Mill's object, in his present volume, is not merely to criticise Hamilton, and to explode his philosophy. He has a philosophy of his own to propound. The principles of Hamilton's philosophy being, to a large extent in reality, and to a still greater extent in appearance, opposed to his own, and having more than those of any other British philosopher taken hold of contemporary philosophic thinkers, and influenced the rising schools of thought, it is all-important for Mr. Mill to bring down the authority of the Scottish philosopher, to expose his errors and inconsistencies, and to show that, so far as his conclusions are opposed to Mr. Mill's own philosophy, they are illogically deduced, or feebly sustained, or in contrariety to principles which Sir William Hamilton himself was constrained to admit, and which sustain the philosophical system of which Mr. Mill is the chief exponent. Mr. Mill's own philosophy, however, is by no means fully disclosed in this volume. Its profile looks out from time to time, and, to our thinking, is dark and forbidding; the full face is never shown. We presume that the present criticism on Hamilton may be regarded as a sort of propædæusis. In due time the negative will be followed by the positive; the preliminary refutation and introductory lessons by the full system of the author. Alexander Bain, Herbert Spencer, John Stuart Mill, with certain minor differences among themselves, may be regarded as the hierophants of the new physiologico-psychological school.

The *Westminster Review* has long been under their influence. Mr. Lewes may be regarded as pre-eminently the *littérateur* of the same school, who will do his full part in impregnating with its principles the atmosphere of current literary and philosophical thought. Female subtlety and genius will not be wanting in its contributions towards the same result, of which some foretokens have already been afforded in *Adam Bede* and elsewhere. Thus, the new school, most influentially represented, will be on us before we are aware. Its success will be helped by the general deficiency of Englishmen, however accomplished, in anything like a thorough philosophic training. Already Mill is, in many respects very deservedly, the greatest authority as a master of thought among the independent young thinkers of our two universities, especially Oxford. Hence, probably, the applause with which his new work has been greeted by such journals as the *Saturday*

Review, which, besides, would no doubt always be disposed to back an Englishman against an over-erudite Scotchman. It may be doubted, however, whether the *Saturday Review* fully understands what it is doing when it sustains Mill and his philosophy. But it is quite certain that Lewes and the writers in the *Fortnightly Review* thoroughly know what they are about, nor must an individual difference between Mr. Spencer and Mr. Mill, such as that on which Mr. Spencer has written to the *Fortnightly*, be allowed to conceal the substantial agreement of their philosophical principles and tendencies.*

"My subject," says Mr. Mill, "is not Sir W. Hamilton, but the questions which Sir W. Hamilton discussed." "The acknowledged position of Sir W. Hamilton, at the head, so far as regards this country, of the school of philosophy to which he belongs, has principally determined me to connect with his name and writings the speculations and criticisms contained in the present work" (p. 2). "On all the subjects on which he touched, he is either one of the most powerful allies of what I deem a sound philosophy, or (more frequently) by far its most formidable antagonist; both because he came the latest, and wrote with a full knowledge of the flaws which had been detected in his predecessors, and because he was one of the ablest, the most clear-sighted, and the most candid" (p. 3).

* In replying to some strictures of Mr. Mill, relating to the application of the test of "unconceivableness" for the determination of "necessary truths," in which strictures Mr. Spencer is, as to this special point, classed with Reid, Stewart, Cousin, Whewell, Kant, and Sir W. Hamilton, in opposition to Mr. Mill's own views (and surely Mr. Mill had need be a very centaur in metaphysical controversy if he is to maintain his fight against such an array of opponents as this enumeration presents), Mr. Spencer himself, in the *Fortnightly Review* (July 15th), thus summarises the points in his own philosophical system which harmonize with the conclusions of Mr. Mill: "Considering that I have avowed a general agreement with Mr. Mill, in the doctrine that all knowledge is from experience, and have defended the test of inconceivableness on the very ground that it 'expresses the net result of our experience up to the present time'; considering that I have endeavoured to show how all our conceptions, even down to those of space and time, are 'acquired'; considering that I have sought to interpret forms of thought (and by implication all intuitions) as products of organized and inherited experiences—I am taken aback at finding myself classed as in the above paragraph." What other definite points, either of agreement or of difference, there are between Mr. Spencer and Mr. Mill, it might be difficult to state. Mr. Mill's philosophy is idealistic; Spencer's seems to be neither idealistic nor materialistic. Mr. Mill observes a complete reserve as to his own views respecting theism; saving only that he appears in his articles on "Auguste Comte," to exclude miraculous interference from his idea of Deity; which, however, is a very significant fact. Probably he does not differ materially from Spencer, who professes to be neither a theist, nor an atheist, nor a pantheist; but still to believe there is *something more* in the universe than operative force.

There could hardly be imagined between two men—both of them eminently able, both thoroughly conversant with the subjects in question, both honest and candid, both living in the same age, both engaged to investigate mental philosophy from its foundations—so complete a contrariety, whether as to their methods of investigation and discussion, their general bias and tendencies, or their conclusions on almost all critical points, as this volume reveals between Mr. Mill and Sir W. Hamilton. “I differ,” says Mr. Mill himself, “from almost everything in his (Sir W. Hamilton’s) philosophy, on which he particularly valued himself, or which is specially his own” (p. 547). “His merits,” he adds, “which, though I do not rate them so high, I feel and admire as sincerely as his most enthusiastic disciples, are rather diffused through his speculations generally, than concentrated in any particular point. They chiefly consist in his clear and distinct mode of bringing before the reader many of the fundamental questions of metaphysics; some good specimens of psychological analysis on a small scale; and the many detached logical and psychological truths which he has separately seized, and which are scattered through his writings, mostly applied to resolve some special difficulty, and again lost sight of” (p. 547). The chief causes which, in Mr. Mill’s judgment, contributed to neutralise so much learning, and such unquestionably superior philosophic faculty, as Sir W. Hamilton possessed, were his adhesion to the doctrine of free-will (!); “the enormous amount of time and mental vigour which he expended on mere philosophical erudition, leaving, it may be said, only the remains of his mind for the real business of thinking;” and “his inability to enter into the very mind of another thinker,” so that he “studied the eminent thinkers,” whether of old or even of modern times, “only from the outside,” being too prepossessed with his own ideas and conclusions, too merely logical, and too merely verbal in his logic, to enter into living sympathy with the doubts, speculations, questionings, reasonings, of other men, as those men felt and meant them (pp. 548, 560).

Such an estimate as this, if ratified by the thinkers of the age, will bring Sir W. Hamilton’s position and authority as a philosopher down to the level of secondary eminence. His disciples have enthroned him among the gods of modern philosophy; Mr. Mill undertakes to teach them that he is nothing more than an able, learned, but very fallible man. “Of all persons, in modern times,” says Mr. Mill, “entitled

to the name of philosophers, the two probably whose reading on their own subjects was the scantiest, in proportion to their intellectual capacity, were Dr. Thomas Brown and Archbishop Whately; accordingly they are the only two of whom Sir W. Hamilton, though acknowledging their abilities, habitually speaks with a tinge of superciliousness. It cannot be denied that both Dr. Brown and Archbishop Whately would have thought and written better than they did, if they had been better read in the writings of previous thinkers; but I am not afraid that posterity will contradict me when I say that either of them has done far greater service in the world, in the origination and diffusion of important thought, than Sir W. Hamilton with all his learning; because, though indolent readers, they were both of them active and fertile thinkers.”*

All must feel something like regret that Sir William Hamilton is no longer living to do battle for himself, and that the controversy which Mr. Mill has set himself to challenge, and by means of which the main course and dominant character of English philosophy during a generation to come may not improbably be determined, is to be fought over the remains of one, who might so well have stood forth among the combatants, as perhaps the greatest of all in name, and as only to be matched in strength and skill by the redoubtable logician and philosopher who has now undertaken the posthumous criticism of his works. On this point Mr. Mill's own words must be quoted,—

“In thus attempting to anticipate, as far as is yet possible, the judgment of posterity on Sir W. Hamilton's labours, I sincerely lament that on the many points on which I am at issue with him, I have the unfair advantage possessed by one whose opponent is no longer in a condition to reply. Personally I might have had small cause to congratulate myself on the reply which I might have received, for though a strictly honourable, he was a most unsparing controversialist, and whoever assailed even the most unimportant of his opinions, might look for hard blows in return. But it would have been worth far more, even to myself, than any polemical success, to have known with certainty in what manner he would have met the objections raised in the present volume. I feel keenly, with Plato, how much more is to be learnt by discussing with a man, who can question and answer, than with a book, which cannot. But it was not possible to take a general review of Sir W. Hamilton's doctrines while they were only known to the world in the fragmentary state in which they were published during his life. His Lectures, the fullest and the only consecutive exposition of his

philosophy, are a posthumous publication; while the latest and most matured expression of many of his opinions, the *Dissertations on Reid*, left off, scarcely half finished, in the middle of a sentence; and so long as he lived, his readers were still hoping for the remainder. The *Lectures*, it is true, have added less than might have been expected to the knowledge we already possessed of the author's doctrines; but it is something to know that we have now all that is to be had: and though we should have been glad to have his opinions on more subjects, we could scarcely have known more thoroughly than we are now at last enabled to do, what his thoughts were on the points to which he attached the greatest importance, and which are most identified with his name and fame."—Pp. 3, 4.

Mr. Mill's examination of Sir William Hamilton's opinions and speculations, extends over the whole ground embraced in Sir William's writings. Beginning with his metaphysics, he proceeds, by a happy arrangement, without any difficulty or deviation, into the region of logical science, the transition between the domain of psychology and that of logic being effected by three chapters which treat respectively of "the Doctrine of Concepts or General Notions," "of Judgment," and "of Reasoning." Having disposed of the questions specifically belonging to psychology and logic, he sums up what remains to be said in five chapters, of which the following respectively are the five titles. "Of some natural prejudices countenanced by Sir William Hamilton, and some Fallacies which he considers Insoluble," "Sir William Hamilton's Theory of Pleasure and Pain," "On the Freedom of the Will," "Sir William Hamilton's Opinions on the Study of Mathematics," "Concluding Remarks."

The critic begins his examination at the beginning. He examines first the foundations of Hamilton's special philosophy, or what was regarded by himself and has by others been commonly accepted as such. Hamilton, we know, professed himself to be a natural realist. "Natural Realism" is the title which he chose as distinctive of that amended and completed edition of the philosophy of Reid, which he believed himself to have elaborated, and which he esteemed it the chief object of his life as a philosopher to present to his age and to bequeath to posterity. The name was well chosen to indicate the position which Hamilton desired to occupy. As a realist, he stood in opposition to idealists, such as Brown or Locke, who maintain that all our primary knowledge is of our own ideas, as revealed in consciousness, and that all we know of the outer world is that there is and must be without us some standing cause of the sensations and perceptions

which we recurrently and unfailingly experience. Hamilton, in opposition to such thinkers as these, whom he defined as "cosmothetic idealists," maintained that our knowledge of the outer world is direct, not inferential. To pure idealists, such as Berkeley, the realism of Hamilton was of course yet more broadly contrary. On the other hand, as a *natural* realist, Hamilton took his position in contrariety to *transcendental* realists, such as Schelling and Cousin, who maintain that man, by a special intuitive power, can know "the infinite" and "the absolute." It was against this school of thought that Hamilton wrote that famous article in the *Edinburgh Review*, some five-and-thirty years ago, which, although perhaps not more than a score of men in Britain could at the time fully appreciate its scope, first revealed the presence in this kingdom of a metaphysician of extraordinary erudition and power, equal to maintain the honour of Britain, and the stress of philosophic controversy, in the profoundest depths of argument, and the most remote excursions of thought. As champion for natural against transcendental realism, it was Hamilton's business to demonstrate the impossibility of the attempt, the futility of the pretence, to grasp the infinite or to reach the absolute by means of human intuition.

Now it is evident that, without great care, the opponent of transcendental realism would be in danger of so expressing himself as to deny the power of human faculties to know Being in any true sense of the word *knowledge*, or of the word *being*, thus contradicting one of the principles of natural realism; and, in like manner, on the other hand, that in maintaining it to be a part of the faculty of every human mind to know the outer world in itself, and not merely as inferrible from the presentation and play of phenomena, there would be not a little danger lest the natural realist should take up some position inconsistent with his argument against the claim of the transcendental realist to enter 'by intuition' within the innermost realm of absolute and eternal being. That the intermediate position of the natural realist cannot be maintained, we are far from asserting. But it must be remembered that only very clear, very subtle, and very thorough thinking could avail to define and maintain between the two other schools a consistent and unassailable position. The first point which Mr. Mill undertakes to demonstrate is, that Sir William Hamilton has not succeeded in thus defining and securing his position, but has, in fact, completely exposed himself on both flanks; that he has, in arguing on each side, laid himself helplessly open to the charge of utterly

contradicting the views which he had affirmed when engaged in argument on the other side.

On the one hand, Sir William, in the first volume of his Lectures, gives the following exposition of the relativity of human knowledge :—

"Matter, or body, is to us the name either of something known, or of something unknown. In so far as matter is a name for something known, it means that which appears to us under the forms of extension, solidity, divisibility, figure, motion, roughness, smoothness, colour, heat, cold, &c.; in short, it is a common name for a certain series, or aggregate, or complement, of appearances or phenomena manifested in coexistence.

"But as these phenomena appear only in conjunction, we are compelled by the constitution of our nature to think them conjoined in and by something; and as they are phenomena, we cannot think them the phenomena of nothing, but must regard them as the properties or qualities of something that is extended, solid, figured, &c. But this something, absolutely and in itself, *i.e.*, considered apart from its phenomena—is to us as zero. It is only in its qualities, only in its effects, in its relative or phenomenal existence, that it is cognizable or conceivable; and it is only by a law of thought which compels us to think something absolute and unknown, as the basis or condition of the relative and known, that this something obtains a kind of incomprehensible reality to us. Now, that which manifests its qualities—in other words, that in which the appearing causes inhere, that to which they belong—is called their *subject*, or *substance*, or *stratum*. To this subject of the phenomena of extension, solidity, &c., the term *matter* or *material substance* is commonly given; and therefore, as contradistinguished from these qualities, it is the name of something unknown and inconceivable.

"The same is true in regard to the term *mind*. In so far as mind is the common name for the states of knowing, willing, feeling, desiring, &c. of which I am conscious, it is only the name for a certain series of connected phenomena or qualities, and, consequently, expresses only what is known. But in so far as it denotes that subject or substance in which the phenomena of knowing, willing, &c. inhere—something behind or under these phenomena—it expresses what, in itself or in its absolute existence, is unknown.

"Thus, mind and matter, as known or knowable, are only two different series of phenomena or qualities; mind and matter, as unknown and unknowable, are the two substances in which these two different series of phenomena or qualities are supposed to inhere. *The existence of an unknown substance is only an inference* we are compelled to make from the existence of known phenomena; and the distinction of two substances is only inferred from the seeming incompatibility of the two series of phenomena to coinhere in one.

"Our whole knowledge of mind and matter is thus, as we have said,

only relative; of existence, absolutely and in itself, we know nothing: and we may say of man what Virgil said of *Æneas*, contemplating in the prophetic sculpture of his shield the future glories of Rome—

“*Rerumque ignarus, imagine gaudet.*” *

Elsewhere, we may here interject, Hamilton expresses himself with not less strength and fulness to the same effect. “All that we know is but *phænomenal*—*phænomenal* of the unknown,” † and again, “Whatever we know, or endeavour to know, God or the world, mind or matter, the distant or the near, however great, and infinite, and various, may be the universe and its contents, these are known to us, *not as they exist*, but as our mind is capable of knowing them.” ‡ And, although he does not follow Kant in making space and time mere “spectral forms” of thought, yet he carries his “philosophy of nescience” so far as to consider both the one and the other to be *but forms* of thought, to which (as apprehended by us) we do not know that there exists any *correspondent* objective reality.

Such expositions as these of the nature and limits of our knowledge, Mr. Mill may well say, “would have satisfied Hartley, Brown, and even Comte.” The doctrine here laid down, so far as it respects the outer world, is precisely the doctrine of “cosmothetic idealism,” to use his own designation, which, especially as expounded by Brown, “is elsewhere the object of some of his most cutting attacks.” So also as respects mind, Sir William represents it as an incognisable “something behind or under” the *phænomena* “of knowing, willing, feeling, desiring, &c.” Mind, therefore, on this showing, is as little known as matter, self as altogether unknown, except as inferrible from certain *phænomena*, as the outer world, or whatever may be included in the not-self.

In all this the anti-transcendentalist speaks strongly out. Here is all that could have been expected from the most thorough opponent of German or of French intuitionism; the author of these utterances may well be regarded as an adherent of what he himself approvingly entitles the “philosophy of nescience.” But now let us hear what the champion of Natural Realism, the follower of Reid, the antagonist of Berkeley’s idealism, of Hume’s scepticism, of the “cosmothetic idealism” of Locke and Brown, has to say for himself and for his school, that we may judge how far in the two characters which he sustains the anti-transcendental realist is consistent with himself.

* *Mill's Examination*, pp. 22, 23. † *Discussions*, p. 608.

‡ *Metaphysics*, vol. i. p. 61.

We take the following quotations and references from Mr. Mill (pp. 18—20). They are only a part of the case as presented by him, but they are all our space will allow us to quote here, and will be amply sufficient for our purpose.

“‘The developed doctrine of Real Presentationism, the basis of Natural Realism’ (the doctrine of the author himself) ‘asserts the consciousness or immediate perception of certain essential attributes of Matter objectively existing; while it admits that other properties of body are unknown in themselves, and only inferred as causes to account for certain subjective affections of which we are cognisant in ourselves. This discrimination, which to other systems is contingent, superficial, extraneous, but to Natural Realism necessary, radical, intrinsic, coincides with what since the time of Locke has been generally known as the distinction of the Qualities of Matter or Body, using these terms as convertible into Primary and Secondary.’

“Further on, he states, in additional development of so-called Natural Realism, ‘that we have not merely a notion, a conception, an imagination, a subjective representation—of Extension, for example—called up or suggested in some incomprehensible manner to the mind, on occasion of an extended object being presented to the sense; but that in the perception of such an object we really have, as by nature we believe we have, an immediate knowledge of that external object *as extended*.’

“‘If we are not percipient of any extended reality, we are not percipient of body as existing; for body exists, and can only be known immediately and in itself, *as extended*. The material world, on this supposition, sinks into something unknown and problematical; and its existence, if not denied, can, at least, be only precariously affirmed, as the occult cause, or incomprehensible occasion, of certain subjective affections we experience in the form either of a sensation of the secondary quality or of a perception of the primary.’ . . .

“‘The Primary Qualities ‘are apprehended as they are in bodies; the Secondary, as they are in us: the Secundo-primary’ (a third class created by himself, comprising the mechanical as distinguished from the geometrical properties of Body) ‘as they are in bodies and as they are in us. . . . We know the Primary qualities immediately as objects of perception; the Secundo-primary both immediately as objects of perception and mediately as causes of sensation: the Secondary only mediately as causes of sensation. In other words: the Primary are known immediately in themselves;

the Secundo-primary, both immediately in themselves and mediately in their effects on us; the Secondary, only mediately in their effects on us. . . . We are conscious, as objects, in the Primary Qualities, of the modes of a not-self; in the Secondary, of the modes of self; in the Secundo-primary, of the modes of self and of a not-self at once."

The passages, indeed, are past counting, in which Sir William Hamilton lays down, as the very principle of his philosophy, and that of his school, that we have *immediate knowledge* of matter and the outer world, as distinguished from *necessary belief*. He asserts that we are conscious "of mind and matter at once." He even, in his Lectures on Metaphysics, uses language so remarkable as, that "we are conscious of the inkstand;" nay, he teaches, as we have already said, that sensation is a state of mind, and equally a state of matter (Reid, pp. 884, 881).

Here, then, in endeavouring to reconcile such declarations as those we quoted on the anti-transcendental side with such as we have now cited, we seem to be brought to a dead lock. Nothing can be more painstaking or exhaustive, than Mr. Mill's examination of all the different modes by which the most patient and subtle skill in interpretation might essay to reconcile the opinions which seem so sharply and strongly to clash; and nothing can be more conclusive than his demonstration that they cannot be reconciled. His ultimate conclusion must be given in his own words:—

"The conclusion I cannot help drawing from this collation of passages is, that Sir W. Hamilton either never held, or when he wrote the Dissertations had ceased to hold, the doctrine for which he has been so often praised and nearly as often attacked—the Relativity of Human Knowledge. He certainly did sincerely believe that he held it. But he repudiated it in every sense which makes it other than a barren truism. In the only meaning in which he really maintained it, there is nothing to maintain. It is an identical proposition and nothing more."—P. 28.

So Mr. Mill appears to be fairly entitled to conclude, and yet we greatly doubt whether, on the other side, we should not be equally entitled to conclude from the same, or an extended collation of passages, that Sir W. Hamilton "either never held, or when he wrote the Dissertations had ceased to hold, the doctrine for which he has been so often praised and nearly as often attacked," viz. that the mind has an *immediate knowledge* of external objects, as distinguished from a *necessary belief*. "He certainly did sincerely believe that he held it.

But he repudiated it in every sense which makes it other than a barren truism. It is an identical proposition and nothing more."

We will here reproduce a paragraph on this very point from our article on "Realism, Ancient and Modern," to which we have already referred. "Sir W. Hamilton, when he enters into detail as regards his own fundamental principles, and 'officially' explains his views, restricts our *knowledge* to what may be given by the principle of non-contradiction. He allows that we *know* we feel what we feel, and will what we will. That is the sum total of the *knowledge* which, in his famous note A, he concedes to men. All beyond this he denies to be *knowledge*, and will only allow to be *belief*. But assuredly this is to deny knowledge altogether. Identical propositions do not constitute knowledge."

Indeed, as we have already seen, even when he claims for the mind the power of being conscious of extension as a sensation, he does not really vindicate for the mind immediate knowledge of matter or of any outward object. Extension, *as a sensation merely*, is not yet apprehended or known as belonging to body, as an attribute of body, as having a reality out of the mind. And, moreover, to know extension as an attribute, would not be to know body as a substance. When the philosopher uses such language, for once only, as to be "conscious of an inkstand," the inkstand being a sharply defined and individual thing, he merely uses indefensibly unphilosophic language.

To us it appears undeniable that Sir W. Hamilton, if judged by his writings, might be proved guilty on two contrary indictments. Mr. Mill, having condemned him on the one indictment, is determined to push the prosecution further in the same direction.

"It has thus been shown," he says, "by accumulated proof, that Sir W. Hamilton did not hold any opinion in virtue of which it could rationally be asserted that all human knowledge is relative;" [this is undoubtedly true, if he is to be judged by the specific opinions, the characteristic tenets, peculiar to his school of "Natural Realism;"] "but did hold, as one of the main elements of his philosophical creed, the opposite doctrine, of the cognoscibility of external things, in certain of their aspects, as they are in themselves, absolutely.

"But if this be true, what becomes of his dispute with Cousin, and with Cousin's German predecessors and teachers?"—P. 31.

Mr. Mill's judgment, in regard to the controversy between Sir William Hamilton and Cousin, is that Hamilton's conclusion is correct, but that his arguments are worth little or

nothing ; that he is right, in maintaining against Cousin that we can have no immediate or intuitive knowledge of God, but that the reasoning by which he endeavours to convict Cousin of error is full of fallacies, while his own principles as a natural realist would afford a ground for sustaining the transcendental realism of Cousin.

It was in his criticism of Cousin, that Hamilton first brought forward his abstract argument in regard to the impossibility of any immediate or proper knowledge, any cognition, of "the infinite," or "the absolute," which he regards as the two distinct abstractions included under the generic notion of "the unconditioned." Around these terms, as employed by Hamilton, there has always rested an impenetrable obscurity. Mr. Calderwood was the first authority, so far as we know, who ventured to express his judgment that the definitions and distinctions of the philosopher were at fault, rather than the intelligence of his readers ; that in fact there was no such distinction between "the infinite" and "the absolute" as Hamilton laid down ; that his conjunction of the two under the vague abstraction of "the unconditioned" was inaccurate and fallacious ; and moreover, that his method of arguing by means of such abstract terms, in order to determine whether man could have a living knowledge of the living Deity, was altogether wrong. For a long time Mr. Calderwood, whose criticism, though just and decisive as to some points of importance, was marred by some fundamental misconceptions, remained almost alone in his challenge of Sir William's abstruse and much lauded arguments, which, doubtless, were the more praised because they were so little understood. The publication of Mansel's "*Limits of Religious Thought*," however, compelled many acute thinkers to direct their attention to the arguments, not only of Mansel, but of his confessed master Hamilton. Professor Mansel has developed to the utmost his master's "philosophy of nescience;" going in this direction far beyond anything which Hamilton had expressed, and even beyond Kant, whom, notwithstanding the strongly pronounced "opinions" which justify Mr. Mill in electing to regard Hamilton as a realist, and as (in effect) denying the relativity of human knowledge, we cannot but regard as the real though unacknowledged master of Hamilton's spirit. In his sceptical defence of faith and orthodoxy, Mansel, whilst far outdoing, yet imitates Hamilton in framing an argument against the possibility of having any knowledge of the Deity, by using as synonyms of Deity the abstract phrases "the infinite," "the absolute," "the unconditioned ;"

deviating, however, as regards the sense which he attaches to the second of these expressions from the definitions of his master. The result of the controversy thus made to turn upon these words and phrases, has been abundantly to demonstrate the ambiguities and fallacies which the use of them involves; and for ever, as we believe, to explode such abstract argumentation for the future, at least in this country, as that of which Professor Mansel has given so transcendent an example. Dr. Young, in his "Province of Reason," and Mr. Calderwood, in a new edition of his "Philosophy of the Infinite," distinguished themselves by the ability with which they criticised the arguments and methods of Hamilton and Mansel. Dr. McCosh, also, in his "Intuitions of the Mind," subsequently published, did service by his acute, but too mild and diffident criticisms, relating to the same points.

Now Mr. Mill comes to reinforce Calderwood, Young, and McCosh. The conjunction is remarkable, seeing that, on most points, the philosophy and the philosophical tendencies of Mr. Mill are precisely contrary to those of the other three, who in fact are what Hamilton supposed and professed himself to be, natural realists, men who regard intuitions as the basis of all thought in all spheres of thought, and who view our intuitive convictions as equivalent to cognitions. When we say that Mr. Mill has come to reinforce these opponents of Hamilton, we mean only as regards his criticism of Hamilton's phrases and arguments. Mr. Mill agrees, as we have seen, with Hamilton's conclusion; and certainly does not agree with the conclusions, as to the same point, of Calderwood, Young, and McCosh. Mr. Mill holds that whatever relates to God is matter of inference *à posteriori*. He has no quarrel with Hamilton's "philosophy of nescience," as such; it is his realism that he fundamentally opposes. His complaint against Hamilton is that, as a "natural realist," he ignores and contradicts his own doctrine, in various places most expressly and emphatically laid down, of "the relativity of human knowledge."* Nothing can be

* While Mr. Mill, so far as this special point of controversy is concerned, appears in the field by the side of Calderwood, Young, and McCosh, Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his "New System of Philosophy," unites himself with Hamilton and Mansel. He appropriates, imitates, and adds to, the dexterous word-playing sophistications out of which Mr. Mansel has woven his argument against the cognoscibility of the infinite, the absolute, the unconditioned; only, unlike Mr. Mansel, he does not, after all, make ostentatious shipwreck of his logic, and betake himself, on the airy wings of an illogical belief-power, to the transcendental region of traditional and dogmatic theology. He presses the premises common to Mr. Mansel and himself rigorously home to their only possible conclusion, and denies that we can have any, the least, knowledge, or any intelligent faith whatever, in regard to a Personal Deity.

more thorough than Mr. Mill's exhibition of the ambiguities, the fallacies, the inconsistencies, involved in Hamilton's definitions and arguments respecting "the infinite," "the absolute," and "the unconditioned." As respects the word *absolute*, he adopts the signification which Hamilton selects, but which, as Mr. Mill shows, he by no means adheres to throughout; a signification which differs somewhat from that assigned to the word by Messrs. Young and Calderwood, and also from that adopted by Mansel, who, whilst professing to agree with Hamilton in his use of the word, in reality employs it in one of the senses which Sir William distinctly rejects. In what sense Mr. Mill uses this word, and with what force of reason he exposes the fallacies of Hamilton's argument in regard to the incognoscibility of what he chooses to speak of as "the infinite" and "the absolute," may be judged by the following important passage, in reading which Mr. Calderwood must have felt greatly gratified to find so much of his own argumentation endorsed by so able a critic as Mr. Mill, especially considering that all the bias of Mr. Mill's philosophy is decidedly contrary to the realistic and semi-transcendental tendency of Mr. Calderwood's teachings in philosophy:—

"In reviewing the series of arguments adduced by Sir W. Hamilton for the incognoscibility and inconceivability of the Absolute, the first remark that occurs is, that most of them lose their application by simply substituting for the metaphysical abstraction 'The Absolute,' the more intelligible concrete expression 'Something absolute.' If the first phrase has any meaning, it must be capable of being expressed in terms of the other. When we are told of an 'Absolute' in the abstract, or of an Absolute Being, even though called God, we are entitled, and if we would know what we are talking about, are bound to ask, absolute in *what*? Do you mean, for example, absolute in goodness, or absolute in knowledge? or do you, perchance, mean absolute in ignorance, or absolute in wickedness? for any one of these is as much an Absolute as any other. And when you talk of something in the abstract which is called The Absolute, does it mean one, or more than one, of these? or does it, peradventure, mean all of them? When (descending to a less lofty height of abstraction) we speak of The Horse, we mean to include every object of which the name horse can be predicated. Or, to take our examples from the same region of thought to which the controversy belongs—when The True or The Beautiful are spoken of, the phrase is meant to include all things whatever that are true, or all things whatever that are beautiful. If this rule is good for other abstractions, it is good for the Absolute. The word is devoid of meaning unless in reference to predicates of some sort. What is absolute must be absolutely something; absolutely

this or absolutely that. The Absolute, then, ought to be a genus comprehending whatever is absolutely anything—whatever possesses any predicate in finished completeness. If we are told therefore that there is some one Being who is, or which is, The Absolute—not something absolute, but the Absolute itself—the proposition can be understood in no other sense than the supposed Being possesses in absolute completeness *all* predicates; is absolutely good, and absolutely bad; absolutely wise, and absolutely stupid; and so forth. The conception of such a being, I will not say of such a God, is worse than a 'fasciculus of negations;' it is a fasciculus of contradictions: and our author might have spared himself the trouble of proving a thing to be unknowable, which cannot be spoken of but in words implying the impossibility of its existence. To insist on such a truism is not superfluous, for there have been philosophers who saw that this must be the meaning of 'The Absolute,' and yet accepted it as a reality. 'What kind of an Absolute Being is that,' asked Hegel, 'which does not contain in itself all that is actual, even evil included?' Undoubtedly; and it is therefore necessary to admit, either that there is no Absolute Being, or that the law, that contradictory propositions cannot both be true, does not apply to the Absolute. Hegel chose the latter side of the alternative; and by this, among other things, has fairly earned the honour which will probably be awarded to him by posterity, of having logically extinguished transcendental metaphysics by a series of *reductiones ad absurdissimum*.

"What I have said of the Absolute is true, *mutatis mutandis*, of the Infinite. This also is a phrase of no meaning, except in reference to some particular predicate; it must mean the infinite in something—as in size, in duration, or in power. These are intelligible conceptions. But an abstract Infinite, a Being not merely infinite in one or in several attributes, but which is 'The Infinite' itself, must be not only infinite in greatness, but also in littleness; its duration is not only infinitely long, but infinitely short; it is not only infinitely awful, but infinitely contemptible; it is the same mass of contradictions as its companion the Absolute. There is no need to prove that neither of them is knowable, since, if the universal law of Belief is of objective validity, neither of them exists.

"It is these unmeaning abstractions, however, these muddles of self-contradiction, which alone our author has proved, against Cousin and others, to be unknowable. He has shown, without difficulty, that we cannot know The Infinite or The Absolute. He has not shown that we cannot know a concrete reality as infinite or as absolute. Applied to this latter thesis, his reasoning breaks down.

"We have seen his principal argument, the one on which he substantially relies. It is, that the Infinite and the Absolute are unknowable because inconceivable, and inconceivable because the only notions we can have of them are purely negative. If he is right in his antecedent, the consequent follows. A conception made up of negations is a conception of Nothing. It is not a conception at all.

"But is a conception, by the fact of its being a conception of something infinite, reduced to a negation? This is quite true of the senseless abstraction 'The Infinite.' That indeed is purely negative, being formed by excluding from the concrete conceptions classed under it, all their positive elements. But in place of 'the Infinite,' put the idea of Something infinite, and the argument collapses at once. 'Something infinite' is a conception which, like most of our complex ideas, contains a negative element, but which contains positive elements also. Infinite space, for instance: is there nothing positive in that? The negative part of this conception is the absence of bounds. The positive are, the idea of space, and of space greater than any finite space. So of infinite duration: so far as it signifies 'without end' it is only known or conceived negatively; but in so far as it means time, and time longer than any given time, the conception is positive. The existence of a negative element in a conception does not make the conception itself negative, and a non-entity. It would surprise most people to be told that 'the life eternal' is a purely negative conception; that immortality is inconceivable. Those who hope for it for themselves have a very positive conception of what they hope for. True, we cannot have an *adequate* conception of space or duration as infinite; but between a conception which though inadequate is real, and correct as far as it goes, and the impossibility of any conception, there is a wide difference. Sir W. Hamilton does not admit this difference. He thinks the distinction without meaning. 'To say that the infinite can be thought, but only inadequately thought, is a contradiction *in adjecto*; it is the same as saying that the infinite can be known, but only known as finite.' I answer, that to know it as anything finite is not to know it as finite. The conception of Infinite as that which is greater than any given quantity, is a conception we all possess, sufficient for all human purposes, and as genuine and good a positive conception as one need wish to have. It is not adequate; our conception of a reality never is. But it is positive; and the assertion that there is nothing positive in the idea of infinity can only be maintained by leaving out and ignoring, as Sir W. Hamilton invariably does, the very element which constitutes the idea. Considering how many recondite laws of physical nature, afterwards verified by experience, have been arrived at by trains of mathematical reasoning grounded on what, if Sir W. Hamilton's doctrine be correct, is a non-existent conception, one would be obliged to suppose that conjuring is a highly successful mode of the investigation of nature. If, indeed, we trifle by setting up an imaginary Infinite which is infinite in nothing in particular, our notion of it is truly nothing, and a 'fasciculus of negations.' But this is a good example of the bewildering effect of putting nonsensical abstractions in the place of concrete realities. Would Sir W. Hamilton have said that the idea of God is but a 'fasciculus of negations?' As having nothing greater than himself, he is indeed conceived negatively. But as himself greater than all other real or imaginable existences, the conception of him is positive.

"Put Absolute instead of Infinite, and we come to the same result. 'The Absolute,' as already shown, is a heap of contradictions, but 'absolute' in reference to any given attribute, signifies the possession of that attribute in finished perfection and completeness. A Being absolute in knowledge, for example, is one who knows, in the literal meaning of the term, everything. Who will pretend that this conception is negative, or unmeaning to us? We cannot, indeed, form an adequate conception of a being as knowing everything, since to do this we must have a conception, or mental representation, of all that he knows. But neither have we an adequate conception of any person's finite knowledge. I have no adequate conception of a shoemaker's knowledge, since I do not know how to make shoes: but my conception of a shoemaker and of his knowledge is a real conception; it is not a fasciculus of negations. If I talk of an Absolute Being (in the sense in which we are now employing the term) I use words without meaning: but if I talk of a Being who is absolute in wisdom and goodness, that is, who knows everything, and at all times intends what is best for every sentient creature, I understand perfectly what I mean: and however much the fact may transcend my conception, the shortcoming can only consist in my being ignorant of the details of which the reality is composed: as I have a positive, and may have a correct conception of the empire of China, though I know not the aspect of any of the places, nor the physiognomy of any of the human beings, comprehended therein."—Pp. 42—47.

Against Sir William's argument that "the unconditioned" is inconceivable, because it includes both "the infinite" and "the absolute," which two are, Sir William maintains, contradictory of each other, Mr. Mill rejoins that the two abstractions do indeed contradict each other, "but not more flagrantly than each of them contradicts itself," and that "there is nothing contradictory in the notion of a being infinite in some attributes and absolute in others, according to the different nature of the attributes" (p. 48).

Passing some minor points in Mr. Mill's exhaustive criticism; barely noting, as we pass, that he explodes Sir William's fallacy in arguing against Cousin, to the effect that God cannot be known as absolute cause, because a cause cannot be absolute; we will quote a short sentence from his masterly examination of Hamilton's untenable, if not unintelligible, position that "to think is to condition," and his summing up of the result of his whole discussion respecting Sir William's criticism of Cousin's transcendentalism:—

"It is evident that Sir W. Hamilton has never decided what extent he intended giving to the term Unconditioned. Sometimes he gives it one degree of amplitude, sometimes another. Between the meanings in which he uses it there is undoubtedly a link of connexion; but this

only makes the matter still worse than if there were none. The phrase has that most dangerous kind of ambiguity, in which the meanings, though essentially different, are so nearly allied that the thinker unconsciously interchanges them one with another."—P. 53.

"If we now ask ourselves, as the result of this long discussion, what Sir W. Hamilton can be considered as having accomplished in this celebrated Essay, our answer must be: That he has established, more thoroughly perhaps than he intended, the futility of all speculation respecting those meaningless abstractions 'The Infinite' and 'The Absolute,' notions contradictory in themselves, and to which no corresponding realities do or can exist. His own favourite abstraction 'The Unconditioned,' considered as the sum of these two, necessarily shares the same fate. If, indeed, it be applied conformably to either of the received meanings of the word condition—if it be understood either as denoting a First Cause, or as a name for all Noumena—it has in each case a signification which can be understood and reasoned about. But as a phrase inflicted with incurable ambiguity, and habitually used by its introducer in several meanings, with no apparent consciousness of their not being the same, it seems to me a very infelicitous creation, and a useless and hurtful intruder into the language of philosophy.

"Respecting the unknowableness, not of 'the Infinite' or 'the Absolute,' but of concrete persons or things possessing infinitely or absolutely certain specific attributes, I cannot think that our author has proved anything; nor do I think it possible to prove them any otherwise unknowable, than that they can only be known in their relations to us, and not as Noumena, or Things in themselves. This, however, is true of the finite as well as of the Infinite, of the imperfect as well as of the completed or absolute. Our author has merely proved the uncognoscibility of a being which is *nothing but* infinite, or *nothing but* absolute: and since nobody supposes that there is such a being, but only beings which are something positive carried to the infinite, or to the absolute, to have established this point cannot be regarded as any great achievement. He has not even refuted M. Cousin; whose doctrine of an intuitive cognition of the Deity, like every other doctrine relating to intuition, can only be disproved by showing it to be a mistaken interpretation of facts; which, again, as we shall see hereafter, can only be done by pointing out in what other way the seeming perceptions may have originated, which are erroneously supposed to be intuitive."—Pp. 55, 56.

With the last sentences in this extract we may connect a passage which occurs a few pages before in the criticism of Hamilton's argument against Cousin, to the effect that "the absolute" cannot be known as "cause," and therefore not as "absolute cause."

"The truth is, M. Cousin's doctrine is too legitimate a product of the metaphysics common to them both, to be capable of being refuted by Sir W. Hamilton. For this knowledge of God in and by his effects,

according to M. Cousin, is knowing him as he is in himself: because the creative power whereby he causes, is in himself, is inseparable from him, and belongs to his essence. And as far as I can see, the principles common to the two philosophers are as good a warrant to M. Cousin for saying this, as to Sir W. Hamilton for maintaining that extension and figure are of the essence of matter, and perceived as such by intuition."—P. 51.

Judged by his "philosophy of nescience," by the positions which he lays down in his criticism of Cousin, by his famous Note A, in his edition of Reid, by many strong and sweeping statements contained in his Lectures and elsewhere, Hamilton's doctrine must be held to be, that man's ignorance is total as respects the whole realm of substance and being. Man can know nothing either of God or of himself; truth is a sphere beyond his approach; of realities he cannot attain a glimmering sight; all around him is but seeming; he does but look upon the investiture of truth and being, through the folds of which, whether shining out in bright colour, or falling down in deep shadows, his eye can nowhere, can never for an instant, pierce. This is really the issue of all Hamilton's metaphysics, strictly defined and interpreted. Even when, as in his exposition of perception, he bethinks himself of his master Reid, and endeavours to compel his philosophy into something like conformity to what would be expected in a system designated "natural realism," his articulate exposition, as we have seen, still refuses to assume the character of positive realism, and comes out as nothing else than "hypothetic realism" or "cosmothetic idealism" disguised, as, in fact, equivalent with that philosophy of Brown, which he so flagrantly condemned, and which he anathematized not less vehemently than High Churchmen were wont in the last generation to anathematize Popery.

Nevertheless, it was not possible for Hamilton to rest content with his own "philosophy of nescience." Although Kant's scepticism had mastered his metaphysical intellect, yet his intellectual instincts, and still more the necessities of his moral nature, compelled him to find for himself and his followers a way of escape from the dreary darkness of his own sceptical metaphysics. Herein also he may be said to have followed, in some sort, the precedent of Kant. Having first built himself up in the fortress of the speculative reason, Kant afterwards hewed his way out by the axe of the practical reason.* So Hamilton escapes from the blank helplessness

* See No. XXX. of this Journal, p. 609.

of his position as a metaphysician, by calling in the power and authority of faith. He falls back upon, to use Mr. Mill's words, "a second source of intellectual conviction called belief; which is anterior to knowledge, is the foundation of it, and is not subject to its limitations; and through the medium of which we may have, and are justified in having, a full assurance of all the things which he has pronounced unknowable to us; and this not exclusively by revelation, that is, on the supposed testimony of a Being whom we have ground for trusting as veracious, but by our natural faculties" (p. 57).

This is the next point in Hamilton's philosophy taken up by Mr. Mill. We do not see what can be said in reply to the following paragraph:—

"In telling us that it is impossible to the human faculties to know anything about Things in themselves, we naturally suppose he intends to warn us off the ground—to bid us understand that this subject of enquiry is closed to us, and exhorts us to turn our attention elsewhere. It appears that nothing of the kind was intended: we are to understand, on the contrary, that we may have the best grounded and most complete assurance of the things which were declared unknowable—an assurance not only equal or greater in degree, but the same in nature, as we have for the truth of our knowledge: and that the matter of dispute was only whether this assurance or conviction shall be called knowledge, or by another name. If this be all, I must say I think it not of the smallest consequence. If no more than this be intended by the 'great axiom' and the elaborate argument against Cousin, a great deal of trouble has been taken to very little purpose; and the subject would have been better left where Reid left it, who did not trouble himself with nice distinctions between belief and knowledge, but was content to consider us as knowing that which, by the constitution of our nature, we are forced, with entire conviction, to believe. According to Sir W. Hamilton, we believe premises, but know the conclusions from them. The ultimate facts of consciousness are 'given less in the form of cognitions than of beliefs:' 'Consciousness in its last analysis, in other words our primary experience, is a faith.' But if we know the theorems of Euclid, and do not know the definition and axioms on which they rest, the word knowledge, thus singularly applied, must be taken in a merely technical sense. In common language, when Belief and Knowledge are distinguished, knowledge is understood to mean complete conviction, Belief a conviction somewhat short of complete; or else we are said to believe when the evidence is probable (as that of testimony), but to know, when it is intuitive, or demonstrative from intuitive premises: we believe, for example, that there is a Continent of America, but know that we are alive, that two and two make four, and that the sum of any two sides of a triangle is greater than the third side. This is a distinction of practical value: but in Sir W. Hamilton's use of the term, it is the

intuitive convictions that are the Beliefs, and those which are dependent and contingent upon them, compose our knowledge. Whether a particular portion of our convictions, which are not more certain, but if anything less certain, than the remainder, and according to our author rest on the same ultimate basis, shall, in opposition to the common usage of mankind, receive exclusively the appellation of knowledge, is at the most a question of terminology, and can only be made to appear philosophically important by confounding difference of name with difference of fact. That anything capable of being said on such a subject should pass for a fundamental principle of philosophy and be the chief source of the reputation of a metaphysical system, is but an example how the mere forms of logic and metaphysics can blind mankind to the total absence of their substance."—Pp. 59—61.

Hamilton's doctrine as to the place and authority of beliefs in our intellectual system, would seem to have been suggested, or at least might have been suggested, by the "faith-philosophy" of Jacobi in the early years of this century, which was a reaction from the metaphysical scepticism of Kant. It has always appeared to us, however, to be, as stated by Hamilton, an amazingly weak and altogether untenable doctrine. The same name is given to the conviction which is said to be antecedent to knowledge and to constitute its foundation, and to the conviction which arises in the mind on the contemplation of facts or phenomena, brought under its notice by the avenue of knowledge; the same scientific classification to the most fundamental intuitions of the consciousness, and to the highest generalisations of the fully informed and perfectly trained intellect; to the instinctive convictions which accompany sensation, and to the judgments of the moral nature; to the postulates on which mathematical reasoning is founded, and to the final conviction attained by a rightly disciplined mind, in regard to the being of a God.

"We do not in propriety *know*," says Sir William, "that what we are compelled to perceive as not self, is not a perception of self; and we can only on reflection, *believe* such to be the case, in reliance on the original necessity of so believing, imposed on us by our nature."* "When I deny that the infinite can by us be *known*," again says Sir William, in his Letter to Mr. Calderwood, "I am far from denying that by us it is, must, and ought to be, *believed*." "St. Austin accurately says, 'We know what rests on *reason*, but believe what rests upon *authority*.' The original data of reason do not rest on reason, but are accepted by reason on the authority of what is beyond

* Dissertations on Reid, pp. 749, 750.

itself. These data are, therefore, in rigid propriety, beliefs or trusts. Thus, in the last resort belief is the primary condition of reason, and not reason the ultimate ground of belief."*

One cannot but wonder what is left for reason to see and know, if all which thus belongs to the category of belief is to be set apart from it. Nor can we less wonder what is left to *knowledge* if we do not know the outer world as not-self; seeing that to feel sensations is not to know sensations as such, and that even the knowledge of phenomena as phenomena involves the consciousness of self as distinguished from phenomena. Nor, once more, can we choose but wonder, what can have a right to be called knowledge, if the very instinctive assurances and convictions on which all knowledge ultimately rests are not to be so called. Mansel has rightly taught us (in his "*Prolegomena Logica*") that all science rests upon intuitive convictions, and that each special science rests upon certain specific intuitions. Dr. McCosh has endeavoured to analyse and classify the intuitions of the mind into intuitive cognitions, intuitive judgments, and intuitive beliefs; and regards these intuitions as constituting the purest, most proper, most fundamental, knowledge. It has, indeed, been luminously shown by Professor Mansel, in his "*Lecture on the Philosophy of Kant*" (pp. 20, 21), that even in sense-perception the intuitive judgment of the intellect, no less than the sensational consciousness, plays a part; that every act of perception is a complex act of the sensitive and intellectual unity, which we designate mind or soul. To what, then, is our knowledge reduced if the term is only applied to that which is given us by our sensational consciousness? This is, in effect, to annihilate knowledge altogether.

On reviewing this subject, with the advantage of Mr. Mill's *Examination* to help us, we can find no better words to express our conclusion than those we employed five years ago. "Assuredly, this is to deny knowledge altogether. The philosopher, indeed, vindicates our fundamental beliefs, *as beliefs*; he maintains that they must be true, or all is false and hollow, and all knowledge impossible for man. He vehemently contends that they must be presumed true, and that they constitute the ground of all certainty and knowledge. But, if so, why does not he boldly and consistently affirm these 'beliefs' to be *known as true*? Consistency demands this. At times he does maintain that we know them. He continually calls them *cognitions*; nay, he would, on their

* Dissertation, p. 760.

behalf, bring again into use the old word *knowledges*. How strange, then, that here in Note A, and elsewhere, he should contend that we know not these principles of knowledge, or anything beyond phenomena."

We have seen that Hamilton set apart our fundamental "beliefs" from our "reason." It is very noteworthy, as showing the perplexing uncertainty of philosophical language, even as employed by modern and contemporary philosophers of the same country, that, according to Coleridge, these fundamental beliefs are the very light and revelation of reason. Reason, according to Coleridge and several writers of ability who have followed his lead, such, for instance, as the late Dr. Harris, is precisely the faculty and source from which, as by a sort of inspiration, all intuitive truths flow out into the consciousness, so as to mingle with and regulate the processes of the logical understanding. So that when Sir William Hamilton contrasts, as in one of the passages lately cited, reason and belief, he is using the term belief in a sense identical with that which Coleridge gives to the word reason, viewed as equivalent to the Alexandrian *Logos*.*

By regarding intuitive conviction or necessary belief as knowledge, Sir W. Hamilton would, indeed, have obliterated the distinction, on the vital importance of which he so much insists, between the "cosmothetic idealism" of Locke and Brown, and his own "natural realism." This, no doubt, would have been humiliating, inasmuch as it would have set aside much severe censure and some almost supercilious criticism. But, on the other hand, it would have rendered his own philosophy much more truly representative of that of Reid; and it would have harmonized portions of his philosophy which at present are mutually irreconcilable.†

* Jacobi was the link of connexion between Hamilton and Coleridge. As to faith and morals, Jacobi was a high authority with Coleridge; "in several important respects he seems to have anticipated the positions maintained by Sir William Hamilton" (*Modern Anglican Theology*, Second Edit., p. 17, note). The publication of Hamilton's Lectures has confirmed this statement. Jacobi is one of Hamilton's highest authorities; there is scarcely another whom he quotes with so much deference as "the great religious philosopher," "the pious and profound Jacobi." He says moreover, "Jacobi originally employed *Glaube* (Belief or Faith)" as synonymous with *Sensus Communis*, common sense, the intuitive faculty, "though he latterly superseded this expression by that of *Vernunft* (Reason)" (*Metaphysics*, vol. i. pp. 37—40, and vol. ii. p. 349). Here, then, Hamilton's Belief and Coleridge's Reason find their common original.

† In a foot-note at the end of his chapter on Hamilton's Doctrine of Consciousness, at a more advanced stage of his Examination than we have reached, Mr. Mill gives an incidental judgment on the point we have discussed in the text, which we cannot but quote in support of our own views. "In many parts," he says, "of Sir

One of the special features in Sir William Hamilton's philosophy is his "Law of the Conditioned." On nothing does he more insist or seem to set a higher value. In his review of Cousin the law is thus stated, "The conditioned is the mean between two extremes, two unconditionates, exclusive of each other, neither of which can be conceived as possible, but of which one must be admitted as necessary. . . The mind is not represented as conceiving two propositions subversive of each other as equally possible: but only as unable to understand as possible, either of the extremes; one of which, however, on the ground of their mutual repugnance, it is compelled to recognise as true."

Sir William argues, in illustration of this law, that it is impossible to conceive space either as finite or as infinite, and yet that one of these contradictories must be true; so again that it is impossible to conceive extension, either as infinitely divisible, or as divisible beyond a certain absolute minimum—a *minimum indivisible*. Similarly, as to time, he says that we can neither conceive an absolute beginning, nor an infinite regress: an absolute termination, nor a duration infinitely prolonged; and as to the will, that it cannot be conceived either as free or as not free; and yet in each case, one of the contradictories must be true. Thus, after the manner of Kant, did Sir William multiply his antinomies, of which may be found a collection in the appendix to the second volume of his Lectures.

In his sixth chapter, on "the Philosophy of the Conditioned," Mr. Mill, in a most rigorous examination, sifts the positions and arguments of Hamilton on that subject. In this chapter, for the first time, we find ourselves at variance with Mr. Mill on several fundamental points. We agree, however, with the greater part of what he says in direct criticism of Hamilton's positions in regard to the philosophy of the conditioned.

W. Hamilton's writings, it seems as if the distinction which he draws between knowledge and belief was meant to correspond to the difference between what we can explain by reference to something else, and those ultimate facts and principles which cannot be referred to anything higher. He often speaks of knowledge as resting ultimately on belief, and of ultimate principles as not known, but believed by a necessity of our nature. The distinction is real, but the employment of the words knowledge and belief to express it, is arbitrary and incongruous. To say that we believe the premises, but know the conclusion, would be understood by every one as meaning that we had other independent evidence of the conclusion. If we only know it through the premises, the same name ought in reason to be given to our assurance of both. Accordingly Sir W. Hamilton himself says, in one of the Dissertations on Reid (p. 763), that 'the principles of our knowledge must be themselves knowledge.' And there are few who will not approve this use of language, and condemn the other."

What can be more just, for instance, than Mr. Mill's criticism upon the phraseology which Hamilton employed in stating his "law of the conditioned" ?—

"In no one case mentioned by Sir W. Hamilton do I believe that he could substantiate his assertion, that 'the Conditioned,' by which he means every object of human knowledge, lies between two 'inconditionate' hypotheses, both of them inconceivable. Let me add, that even granting the inconceivability of the two opposite hypotheses, I cannot see that any distinct meaning is conveyed by the statement that the Conditioned is 'the mean' between them, or that 'all positive thought,' 'all that we can positively think,' 'lies between' these two 'extremes,' these 'two opposite poles of thought.' The extremes are, Space in the aggregate considered as having a limit, Space in the aggregate considered as having no limit. Neither of these, says Sir W. Hamilton, can we think. But what we can positively think (according to him) is not Space in the aggregate at all; it is some limited space, and this we think as square, as circular, as triangular, or as elliptical. Are triangular and elliptical a mean between infinite and finite? They are, by the very meaning of the words, modes of the finite. So that it would be more like the truth to say that we think the pretended mean under one of the extremes; and if infinite and finite are 'two opposite poles of thought,' then in this polar opposition, unlike voltaic polarity, all the matter is accumulated at one pole. But this counterstatement would be no more tenable than Sir W. Hamilton's; for in reality, the thought which he affirms to be a medium between two extreme statements, has no correlation with those statements at all. It does not relate to the same object. The two counter-hypotheses are suppositions respecting Space at large, Space as a collective whole. The 'conditioned' thinking, said to be the mean between them, relates to parts of Space, and classes of such parts; circles and triangles, or planetary and stellar distances. The alternative of opposite inconceivabilities never presents itself in regard to them; they are all finite, and are conceived and known as such. What the notion of extremes and a mean can signify, when applied to propositions in which different predicates are affirmed of different subjects, passes my comprehension: but it served to give greater apparent profundity to the 'Fundamental Doctrine,' in the eyes not of disciples (for Sir W. Hamilton was wholly incapable of quackery) but of the teacher himself."—Pp. 84, 85.

Again, there is, we apprehend, profound truth at the foundation of the following observations in respect to the assumption that, in all spheres and in regard to all classes of subjects, one of two contradictory predications must be true. At all events, the paragraph deserves to be carefully pondered.

"I should not, of course, dream of denying this, when the propositions are taken in a phenomenal sense; when the subjects and predicates of them are interpreted relatively to us. The Will, for example,

is wholly a *phænomena*; it has no meaning unless relatively to us; and I of course admit that it must be either free or caused. Space and Time, in their *phænomenal* character, or as they present themselves to our perspective faculties, are necessarily either bounded or boundless, infinitely or only finitely divisible. The law of Excluded Middle, as well as that of Contradiction, is common to all *phænomena*. But it is a doctrine of our author that these laws are true, and cannot but be known to be true, of *Noumena* likewise. It is not merely Space as cognisable by our senses, but Space as it is in itself, which he affirms must be either of unlimited or of limited extent. Now, not to speak at present of the Principle of Contradiction, I demur to that of Excluded Middle as applicable to Things in themselves. The law of Excluded Middle is, that whatever predicate we suppose, either that or its negative must be true of any given subject: and this I do not admit when the subject is a *Noumenon*; inasmuch as every possible predicate, even negative, except the single one of Non-entity, involves, as a part of itself, something positive, which part is only known to us by *phænomenal* experience, and may have only a *phænomenal* existence. The universe, for example, must, it is affirmed, be either infinite or finite: but what do these words mean? That it must be either of infinite or finite magnitude. Magnitudes must be either infinite or finite, but before affirming the same thing of the *Noumenon* Universe, it has to be established that the universe as it is in itself is capable of the attribute magnitude. How do we know that magnitude is not exclusively a property of our sensations—of the states of subjective consciousness which objects produce in us? Or if this supposition displeases, how do we know that magnitude is not, as Kant considered it, a form of our minds, an attribute with which the laws of thought invest every conception that we can form, but to which there may be nothing analogous in the *Noumenon*, the Thing in itself? The like may be said of Duration, whether infinite or finite, and of Divisibility, whether stopping at a minimum or prolonged without limit. Either the one proposition or the other must of course be true of duration and of matter as they are perceived by us—as they present themselves to our faculties; but duration itself is held by Kant to have no real existence out of our minds; and as for matter, not knowing what it is in itself, we know not whether, as affirmed of matter in itself, the word divisible has any meaning. Believing divisibility to be an acquired notion, made up of the elements of our sensational experience, I do not admit that the *Noumenon* Matter must be either infinitely or finitely divisible. As already observed, the only contradictory alternative of which the negative side contains nothing positive is that between Entity and Non-entity, Existing and Non-existing; and so far as regards that distinction, I admit the law of Excluded Middle as applicable to *Noumena*; they must either exist or not exist. But this is all the applicability I can allow to it.”—Pp. 86, 87.

Mr. Mill is a sensational idealist of the school of Hume. In other parts of his volume his tendency to reduce all things

to the ideas of sense and the associations of such ideas comes fully out. Here the idealism which, if it does not deny the existence of matter, holds its existence to be a thing unproved, seems to show itself. Kant endeavoured to escape from the dilemmas of his antinomies, by resolving the seeming contradictions involved in them into mere forms or modes of thought, to which there is no absolute correspondency in the realities themselves which lie beyond. And if matter be, as an increasing number of philosophers think, only force; if extension be, as Sir W. Hamilton himself taught, at bottom only a sensation, as truly a sensation as colour itself, of course the difficulties in regard to the infinity of space become mere perplexities of sense, not contradictions in the region of being. Although, however, very unwilling to dogmatize as to what may be the idea necessarily attached to the notion of material substance, and even disposed to concede that space, if it be anything but an empty nothing, is but a form of sensibility, we confess that we have never been able to comprehend Kant's position, which Hamilton does not seem to dispute, that duration has no real existence out of our minds. Assuredly, duration has no real existence apart from mind, the mind of the creature or of the Creator, or of both Creator and creature. Our sense of duration is, no doubt, derived from the consciousness of our own thoughts and sensations, and volitions, in their differences and their succession. But, at the same time, the sense of duration would seem to be inseparable from the life of consciousness, and to be common to all intelligences.

As to the detailed solution which Mr. Mill attempts of the difficulties arising out of the questions of space, time, and infinity, we only in part agree with him. Our object, however, in the present article, is not to discuss Mr. Mill's own contributions to positive philosophy, but to present a view of his criticism of the Hamiltonian philosophy. This is a subject in itself of such importance and extent, as to demand all the space at our disposal for one article. And Mill's own philosophy must assuredly have an article to itself, in an early number of this Journal. The present paper will clear the way for an intelligent and consecutive criticism of Mill's own elaborate system of empiricism and unreality.

We must, however, quote one passage which shows to what length Mr. Mill is prepared to go in his determination to admit neither difficulties nor laws in regard to thought, except the laws of mental association grounded upon experience.

"That we are unable to conceive an end to space I fully acknowledge. . . . But we have no ground to believe that it is so from the original structure of our minds. We can suppose that in some other state of existence we might be transported to the end of space, when, being apprised of what had happened by some impression of a kind utterly unknown to us now, we should at the same instant become capable of conceiving the fact, and learn that it was true. After some experience of the new impression, the fact of an end to space would seem as natural to us as the revelations of sight to a person born blind, after he has been long enough couched to have become familiar with them. But as this cannot happen in our present state of existence, the experience which would render the association dissoluble is never obtained; and an end to space remains inconceivable."—P. 79.

So violent a paradox as this will test the digestive powers even of a trained metaphysician. As respects, however, the difficulties which have come to be associated with the thought of the infinitude of space, it is surely time that a clear-sighted and thorough-going metaphysical philosophy should finally resolve these into the mere verbal perplexities, which in truth is all that they are. What in fact is infinite space but an "infinite deal of nothing?" Space is neither a substance, as Descartes, followed by Spinoza, made it in effect to be; nor is it an attribute, as Clarke would seem to have made it; nor is it, as Gassendi taught, something of a nature intermediate between substance and attribute, whatever that might be; nor is it even a mode, as many have imagined. Like length or breadth, it is a mere abstraction; or perhaps we might say that it is emptiness conceived as capable of being filled by material substance. When straightforwardly looked at, the mysteries and difficulties which have been woven about the notion of space, all collapse and come to nothing.

This is the conclusion we come to, if, refusing to be spell-bound by the misapplication to a mere negative abstraction, or at most a mere potentiality, of the epithet infinite, which can only be properly applied to some reality, be it being, virtue, force, or magnitude, we insist upon seeing things as they really are. There is, however, if we will attain to a full and positive solution of the questions concerning space, a subtler and more difficult question beneath. Under the thought of space lies the thought of extension, although we agree with Mr. Calderwood that extension is not to be regarded as equivalent to space.* This question as to the nature of extension, is most carefully investigated by Mr. Mill in a later chapter of this volume.† He develops Mr. Bain's views upon

* Calderwood's *Philosophy of the Infinite*, 2nd Edition, p. 331.

† The Psychological Theory of the Primary Qualities of Matter.

this point in a very masterly analysis. The result is, that in harmony with Berkeley's "Theory of Vision," he resolves the sense of extension into that of duration, the duration of muscular effort and activity, of which, in its various degrees, the various and variously combined sensations of colour afford, according to a uniform experience, the unerring indications. Into this profound question, we cannot enter in this article. Supposing, however, that on this point Mr. Mill's conclusions should be generally accepted by philosophers, it is obvious that by the elimination altogether of the element of space as an independent factor among the perplexities of sense-perception, we shall have gained much in the way of simplification and relief. Extension, on this view, represents a real form of sensibility, while space does but mean the unlimited possibility of such sensations as give the perceptions with which we connect the general notion of extension.

We anticipate, however, a very stubborn resistance on the part of such natural realists as Dr. Young and Dr. McCosh, to Mr. Mill's attempt to resolve extension into a *mere* sensation. If we escape from Mr. Mill's subtle analysis, and meditate on extension, we find it almost invincibly hard to acquiesce in any resolution of visual extension into a mere equivalent to a blind man's idea of extension. Nevertheless, before Mr. Mill's analysis is conclusively rejected by any thinker, it will be well to weigh what is so finely urged in behalf of what is virtually the same theory, by that matchless analyst and marvellous writer, Bishop Berkeley, in his famous "Theory of Vision," which, though the production of a young man of five-and-twenty, and altogether revolutionary in its character,—like a new metaphysical revelation—became at once a classical treatise, and has ever since remained, on its subject, the highest authority, unapproachable for completeness of investigation, clearness and consecutive-ness of reasoning, and chaste perfection of philosophic style.

The one stupendous difficulty connected with the thought of "the infinite" or "the unconditioned," the one and only difficulty, we might almost say, in the universe, is self-existence. Here Hamilton's dilemma does hold, and all that Mill has said, has, to our thinking, availed nothing whatever for its resolution or diminution; as indeed what that any man could say, could avail for this? Assuredly the conception of the uncaused cause is impossible for us; and yet it must be true, the contrary we cannot but hold to be impossible. But all mystery seems to centre here; and when once the thinker has opened his soul reverently and

lowly to receive the mystery of the Self-existent, all other insolubilities will become light to him; nay, in this one master-mystery all will appear to be absorbed and to coalesce. Here *lives* the mystery of infinite duration. After this, why seek for this mystery, in its abstract form, anything like a metaphysical resolution? And though in itself the mystery of life, wherever found, of mind, of individuality, of free-will, be altogether inscrutable; yet he that comprehends what it is to believe in the Self-existent, will only placidly wonder at all the rest.

With verbal and arithmetical difficulties, however, about "the infinite," and different grades of "infinities," "sub-infinities," "multiple-infinities," and we know not what, we have long been out of patience. Puzzles which ought to be merely the exercises of a school-boy's ingenuity, have far too long been the serious perplexity of thoughtful men. It might be pardonable, in the age of Leibnitz, for even so acute a philosopher as Leibnitz, having in view an array of so-called infinite series and of asymptote lines, to involve himself in verbal quibbles about infinite lines and infinite series, about so-called infinities of different degrees. But now-a-days we should be educated beyond all that, and nothing is more remarkable than that Sir William Hamilton, in that enumeration of "contradictions proving the psychological theory of the conditioned," to which we have referred as contained in the appendix to his "*Lectures on Metaphysics*," should have thought such verbal quibbles or arithmetical puzzles as we have described worthy of being stated as insoluble perplexities. Among this goodly array, besides some dilemmas or antinomies which present real difficulties, may be found the old Eleatic sophisms, to prove the impossibility of motion, and other dilemmas of which what we are about to quote may be taken as a specimen. "An infinite number of quantities must make up either an infinite or a finite whole. 1. The former. But an inch, a minute, a degree, contain each an infinite number of quantities; therefore an inch, a minute, a degree, are each infinite wholes; which is absurd. 2. The latter. An infinite number of quantities would thus make up a finite quantity, which is equally absurd."* In his chapter on "Fallacious Modes of Thought" countenanced by Sir William Hamilton, Mr. Mill has, as a sort of appendix to his consecutive criticism of the principles of Hamilton's philosophy, taken up several of these

* Appendix, *Lectures on Metaphysics*, vol. ii. p. 521.

problems assumed by Sir William to be insoluble, and given their solution. Sir William had said that the fallacy of the Eleater Zeno's demonstration of the impossibility of motion had not yet been detected. Nothing can be more happy or complete than Mr. Mill's disentanglement of the fallacies involved in this "Demonstration" (pp. 474—476).

And as respects what Mr. Mill describes as "Sir W. Hamilton's series of riddles respecting infinity," the principle of disentanglement is sufficiently clear and simple, notwithstanding all the mystification which has been allowed to rest upon the meaning and relations of the various grades of "infinities." Some of our readers may perhaps, like ourselves, remember meeting with these riddles about asymptotic curves and their asymptotes, and about infinite series, and infinite divisibilities, in the meritorious "Letters" of good Olinthus Gregory on the "Evidences of the Christian Religion," which, thirty years ago, was a book recommended to young inquirers about the Christian evidences. Dr. Gregory endeavours, by the adduction of these instances of mathematical mysteries and apparent contradictions, to abate the strangeness, or to silence the disbeliever, of the holy mysteries of the Christian religion; just, indeed, as Hamilton uses the like supposed antinomies or contradictions to illustrate and confirm his philosophy of the conditioned. The solution which suggested itself to us in prosecuting our mathematical studies many years ago appears still to us to be clear and satisfactory. We know that $1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16} + \dots$, &c., *ad infinitum* = 2; that is, thus the infinite series *so called* is equal to a finite sum. This is the one mystery, and mother of mysteries, if there is any mystery at all. But what does this equation mean, if interpreted as a practical proposition? No more than this—that, while you cannot actually go on for ever dividing anything into successive portions, the half, the quarter, the eighth, and so on, yet, *if you could, the sum of all the fractional parts, the half, the fourth, the eighth, &c., would just amount to the one whole, the unit*, on which you began to operate; and that the further you go on in adding the continually bisected parts to each other, the more nearly you approach the total sum of the unit. This simple and almost self-evident truth, and nothing more, is the common-sense meaning of $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16} + \dots$ &c. = 1, or $1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \dots$ &c. = 2.

This is by no means the first time that we have emphatically expressed our views respecting this point in this Journal. In particular, we took the opportunity, two years ago, in reviewing Saisset's "Essays on Religious Philosophy" (generally

known by the title "Modern Pantheism"), in which even that masterly writer appears to be at fault on this point, to give the solution which we have now repeated. "Nothing is more natural," we said, in connexion with this point, "than that mathematicians should fail to discern the essential distinction between mathematical and spiritual infinitude, should fail to perceive that the mathematical infinite is in no true sense an infinite at all. But it is surely time modern metaphysicians and philosophers had got beyond this point."

It is satisfactory to be able to quote Mr. Mill in confirmation of the view we have thus expressed:—

"Not only is one infinity greater than another, but one infinity may be infinitely greater than another. Mathematicians habitually assume this, and reason from it; and the results always coming out true, the assumption is justified. But mathematicians, I must admit, seldom know exactly what they are about when they do this. As the results always prove right, they know empirically that the process cannot be wrong—that the premises must be true in a sense; but in what sense, it is beyond the ingenuity of most of them to understand. The doctrine long remained a part of that mathematical mysticism, so mercifully shown up by Berkeley in his 'Analyst,' and 'Defence of Freethinking in Mathematics.' To clear it up required a philosophical mathematician—one who should be both a mathematician and a metaphysician: and it found one. To complete Sir William Hamilton's discomfiture, this philosophic mathematician is his old antagonist Mr. De Morgan, whom he described as too much of a mathematician to be anything of a philosopher. Mr. De Morgan, however, has proved himself, so far as this subject is concerned, a far better metaphysician than Sir W. Hamilton. He has let the light of reason into all the logical obscurities and paradoxes of the infinitesimal calculus. By merely following out, more thoroughly than had been done before, the rational conception of infinitesimal division, as synonymous with division into as many and as small parts as we choose, Mr. De Morgan, in his Algebra, has fully explained and justified the conception of successive orders of differentials, each of them infinitely less than the differential of the preceding, and infinitely greater than that of the succeeding order. Whoever is acquainted with this masterly specimen of analysis, will find his way through Sir W. Hamilton's series of riddles respecting Infinity, without ever being at a loss for their solution."—P. 478.

The thread which has held together what we have been writing for several pages past is Hamilton's "Philosophy of the Conditioned." And, although we have left the chapter in which Mr. Mill professedly criticizes this part of Sir William's speculations, yielding some scope to our own reflections, and passing forward to the chapter in which, near the

end of the volume, Mr. Mill takes up points relating to this subject which he did not allow himself to pursue in the chapter expressly devoted to this criticism, yet we have never wandered from the subject itself. We must now return to Mr. Mill's chapter on "the Philosophy of the Conditioned," that we may note some of the points brought forward in this chapter, in regard to which, as we have intimated, we cannot but altogether disagree with Mr. Mill, and regret the tendency of his philosophy. We have already explained that, in this article, we have no intention of entering into argument with Mr. Mill. We are bound, however, whilst agreeing with so much else, here to enter our caveat against Mr. Mill's own positive teaching and special philosophy.

Nearly all philosophers, hitherto, have, within certain limits, held that if any proposition be inconceivable, it cannot be true, and that, if the contrary of any proposition cannot be conceived, that proposition must be true. We say, within certain limits, this has been held to be the case—the limits, viz., of human sensibility and experience. If we have to deal with subjects which transcend our human sensibility or experience, which belong properly to the invisible and infinite world, and of which we can but have a very limited and indirect knowledge, the same thing will not hold; for man is not absolutely the measure of all things, nor has he any camera by which to attain to a view of the supersensible. But, within the limits defined, the limits, that is, of human science properly so called, inconceivability has hitherto been regarded by philosophers in general as affording a decisive test, in regard to many subjects of thought, by which to discriminate between truth and falsehood. Mr. Mill entirely rejects this test. What is or is not, what may or may not be, conceivable or inconceivable, is with him a mere question of the association of ideas. It is merely owing to the inseparable, because invariable, association of ideas that we pronounce with such absolute confidence that two straight lines cannot inclose a space, and that two and two do not make five, but four. It is possible that under other conditions of association and in a different world we might be able to conceive two straight lines as enclosing a space, and that two and two might make together five, not four! To our thinking, this is as much as to say that A is not A; and an analysis much less ingenious and much less difficult than some of those specimens of analysis which Mr. Mill has in this volume given us would, as we imagine, suffice to show the worthlessness of the sophisms by which the essayist whom Mr. Mill

quotes with approval attempts to establish positions so extraordinary as those which we have signalised.

Certain it is, that if the test of conceivability or inconceivability be not, within the limits we have defined, the test of possibility or impossibility, and, rightly applied, of truth or falsehood, there can be no such test, and absolute truth in any sphere is altogether unattainable. The demonstrations of mathematics all rest on this test; all the axioms are but applications of this test. What in thought is repugnant, what is impossible to be conceived, must, within the sphere in which human thought is competent, and which human experience pervades, be pronounced to be impossible; or else nothing can be known to be impossible, and abstract truth is unattainable.

But, indeed, Mr. Mill holds that abstract truth is unattainable. According to him, all our knowledge is, indeed, mere belief, and belief which might change, which, for ought we know, *might* be reversed; belief which rests only upon inductive evidence, the evidence of human experience—an experience which discloses, which presumes, no deeper foundation of law than is, so far, *as a matter of fact and history*, manifested in itself, and which we are not allowed to regard as bespeaking any constant will or mind of the Supreme, or any truth in the absolute nature of things of which it is the expression. Hence, in harmony with his settled principle, that there is no such thing as necessary truth, or, at least, that we cannot know that there is, he denies that inconceivability can, under any conditions, be construed as impossibility.

The doctrine that there is no such thing as absolute truth in any sphere attainable by man agrees tolerably well with the "nescience" side of Sir William Hamilton's philosophy. Indeed, between Mr. Mill's own conclusions respecting truth and certainty, and those of Mr. Mansel, in his celebrated development of Hamilton's "philosophy of nescience," as applied especially to theology,* there would seem to be but little difference. Nevertheless, nothing can be more complete than Mr. Mill's antagonism to the methods of reasoning employed by Professor Mansel in his "Lectures," and nothing more decisive than his condemnation of the manner in which Mr. Mansel has applied his philosophy to defend the positions or traditions of dogmatic theology. Mr. Mansel endeavours by a course of abstruse logical reasoning to

* Mansel's Bampton Lectures on "Limits of Religious Thought."

demonstrate that man can have no true knowledge of God; and hence he argues that no reclamation of human reason, against what the Church has received as the supernatural revelation of the Divine attributes and counsels, can have any authority or any weight. Mr. Mill assents to Mr. Mansel's conclusion that man can have no true knowledge of God, but unsparingly criticizes and condemns the reasoning by which he undertakes to establish his conclusion; whilst he entirely disallows the inference from this conclusion respecting the position in which human reason must stand in regard to revealed doctrines.

How gravely we differ from Mr. Mansel, both as to the methods and the general moral of his Lectures, we felt it our duty to set forth not long after the publication of the Lectures; and as Mr. Mill's criticism, to a large extent, coincides with our own, we must be expected so far to agree with Mr. Mill. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Mill has marred a chapter, which in the main is sound and good, and which contains some excellent passages, by one or two serious blemishes. Because of its theological bearing, this chapter has attracted a share of public attention very far beyond what a mere regard to its significance and importance, either as an item in the total array of Mr. Mill's criticisms upon the Hamiltonian philosophy, or as related to the scheme and structure of Mr. Mill's own philosophy, could have warranted. There is in it absolutely no originality, although there is much clearness and force. But as Mr. Mill, on the one hand, seems to us to have gone a little out of his way to cast a stone with vehement animosity, at an argument which never had many potent defenders, and may, for a good while past, be said to have had no apologist of any eminence, except indeed its eminent and able author; so theological critics and the religious world have bestowed a disproportionate amount of attention on a chapter which, although containing one very unseemly and one very suspicious sentence, is in the main not only sound philosophy, but good and reverent theology; while at the same time they have passed almost without notice, statements and intimations which seem to us to be, however cautiously expressed, charged with such heresy, both philosophical and moral, as cannot fail, in proportion as it is embraced, to produce results the most disastrous, both as regards faith and practice, the virtue, the hopes, and the happiness of mankind. No doubt the fact that, soon after the publication of this volume, Mr. Mill's name was brought forward as a parliamentary candidate for the representation

of Westminster, and that among the party politically opposed to him were to be found some leading ecclesiastical critics and some redoubtable defenders of orthodoxy, largely contributed to the result we have stated. On the other hand, however, political sympathy and latitudinarian proclivities, joined to the chivalrous desire to shield from the effects of the *odium theologicum* one of the ablest logicians and political philosophers of this or of any age, brought full compensation to Mr. Mill, for anything which he might have been supposed to have suffered from the causes we have mentioned. The secular press, in general, sustained him; and such men as Mr. Kingsley and Dean Stanley published to the world their admiration of what the *Record* and the *British Standard* condemned. And yet, even although agreeing with Mr. Mill in the general strain of his argument, as it was to be expected that Kingsley and Stanley would do, surely they must, on calm reflection, admit that the offensive sentences in Mr. Mill's criticism of Professor Mansel were a perfectly needless outbreak of vehemence, in the course of a high moral argument, and would on that account alone have been in bad taste, even if their author had not chosen, without any occasion for so doing, to employ language which strongly savoured of irreverence.

What can be more orthodox or more excellent than the passages which follow, and which may be fairly said to contain the pith of Mr. Mill's argumentation against Mansel in this chapter?

"The whole of Mr. Mansel's argument for the inconceivability of the Infinite and of the Absolute is one long *ignoratio elenchi*. It has been pointed out in a former chapter that the words Absolute and Infinite have no real meaning, unless we understand by them that which is absolute or infinite in some given attribute; as space is called infinite, meaning that it is infinite in extension; and as God is termed infinite in the sense of possessing infinite power, and absolute in the sense of absolute goodness, or knowledge. It has also been shown that Sir W. Hamilton's arguments for the unknowableness of the Unconditioned, do not prove that we cannot know an object which is absolute or infinite in some specific attribute, but only that we cannot know an abstraction called 'The Absolute' or 'The Infinite,' which is supposed to have all attributes at once. The same remark is applicable to Mr. Mansel, with only this difference, that he, with the laudable ambition I have already noticed of stating everything explicitly, draws this important distinction himself, and says, of his own motion, that the Absolute he means is the abstraction. He says, that the Absolute can be 'nothing less than the sum of all reality,' the complex of all positive predicates, even those which are exclusive of one another: and

expressly identifies it with Hegel's Absolute Being, which contains in itself 'all that is actual, even evil included.' 'That which is conceived as absolute and infinite,' says Mr. Mansel, 'must be conceived as containing within itself the sum not only of all actual, but of all possible modes of being.' One may well agree with Mr. Mansel that this farrago of contradictory attributes cannot be conceived: but what shall we say of his equally positive averment that it must be believed? If this be what the Absolute is, what does he mean by saying that we must believe God to be the Absolute?

"The remainder of Mr. Mansel's argumentation is suitable to this commencement. The Absolute, as conceived, that is, as he defines it, cannot be 'a whole composed of parts,' or 'a substance consisting of attributes,' or 'a conscious subject in antithesis to an object. For if there is in the absolute any principle of unity, distinct from the mere accumulation of parts or attributes, this principle alone is the true absolute. If, on the other hand, there is no such principle, then there is no absolute at all, but only a plurality of relatives. The almost unanimous voice of philosophy, in pronouncing that the absolute is both one and simple, must be accepted as the voice of reason also, so far as reason has any voice in the matter. But this absolute unity, as indifferent and containing no attributes, can neither be distinguished from the multiplicity of finite beings by any characteristic feature, nor be identified with them in their multiplicity.' It will be noticed that the Absolute, which was just before defined as having all attributes, is here declared to have none: but this, Mr. Mansel would say, is merely one of the contradictions inherent in the attempt to conceive what is inconceivable. 'Thus we are landed in an inextricable dilemma. The Absolute cannot be conceived as conscious, neither can it be conceived as unconscious: it cannot be conceived as complex, neither can it be conceived as simple: it cannot be conceived by difference, neither can it be conceived by the absence of difference: it cannot be identified with the universe, neither can it be distinguished from it.' Is this chimerical abstraction the Absolute Being whom anybody need be concerned about, either as knowable or as unknowable? Is the inconceivableness of this impossible fiction any argument against the possibility of conceiving God, who is neither supposed to have no attributes nor to have all attributes, but to have good attributes? Is it any hindrance to our being able to conceive a Being absolutely just, for example, or absolutely wise? Yet it is of this that Mr. Mansel undertook to prove the impossibility.

"Again, of the Infinite: according to Mr. Mansel, being 'that than which a greater is inconceivable,' it 'consequently can receive no additional attribute or mode of existence which it had not from all eternity.' It must therefore be the same complex of all possible predicates which the Absolute is, and all of them infinite in degree. It 'cannot be regarded as consisting of a limited number of attributes, each unlimited in its kind. It cannot be conceived, for example, after the analogy of a line, infinite in length, but not in breadth; or of a

surface, infinite in two dimensions of space, but bounded in the third ; or of an intelligent being, possessing some one or more modes of consciousness in an infinite degree, but devoid of others.' This Infinite, which is infinite in all attributes, and not solely in those which it would be thought decent to predicate of God, cannot, as Mr. Mansel very truly says, be conceived. For 'the infinite, if it is to be conceived at all, must be conceived as potentially everything and actually nothing ; for if there is anything general which it cannot become, it is thereby limited ; and if there is anything in particular which it actually is, it is thereby excluded from being any other thing. But again, it must also be conceived as actually everything and potentially nothing ; for an unrealised potentiality is likewise a limitation. If the infinite can be that which it is not, it is by that very possibility marked out as incomplete, and capable of a higher perfection. If it is actually everything, it possesses no characteristic feature by which it can be distinguished from anything else, and discerned as an object of consciousness.' Here certainly is an Infinite whose infinity does not seem to be of much use to it. But can a writer be serious who bids us conjure up a conception of something which possesses infinitely all conflicting attributes, and because we cannot do this without contradiction, would have us believe that there is a contradiction in the idea of infinite goodness, or infinite wisdom ? Instead of 'The Infinite,' substitute 'an infinitely good Being,' and Mr. Mansel's argument reads thus : If there is anything which an infinitely good Being cannot become—if he cannot become bad—that is a limitation, and the goodness cannot be infinite. If there is anything which an infinitely good Being actually is (namely good), he is excluded from being any other thing, as from being wise or powerful. I hardly think that Sir W. Hamilton would patronise this logic, learnt though it be in his school."—Pp. 93—96.

"Here, then, I take my stand on the acknowledged principle of logic and of morality, that when we mean different things we have no right to call them by the same name, and to apply to them the same predicates, moral and intellectual. Language has no meaning for the words Just, Merciful, Benevolent, save that in which we predicate them of our fellow-creatures ; and unless that is what we intend to express by them, we have no business to employ the words. If in affirming them of God we do not mean to affirm these very qualities, differing only as greater in degree, we are neither philosophically nor morally entitled to affirm them at all. If it be said that the qualities are the same, but that we cannot conceive them as they are when raised to the infinite, I grant that we cannot adequately conceive them in one of their elements, their infinity. But we can conceive them in their other elements, which are the very same in the infinite as in the finite development. Anything carried to the infinite must have all the properties of the same thing as finite, except those which depend upon the finiteness. Among the many who have said that we cannot conceive infinite space, did any one ever suppose that it is *not* space ? that

it does not possess all the properties by which space is characterized? Infinite Space cannot be cubical or spherical, because these are modes of being bounded: but does any one imagine that in ranging through it we might arrive at some region which was not extended; of which one part was not outside another; where, though no Body intervened, motion was impossible; or where the sum of two sides of a triangle was less than the third side? The parallel assertion may be made respecting infinite goodness. What belongs to it as Infinite (or more properly as Absolute) I do not pretend to know; but I know that infinite goodness must be goodness, and that what is not consistent with goodness, is not consistent with infinite goodness. If in ascribing goodness to God I do not mean what I mean by goodness; if I do not mean the goodness of which I have some knowledge, but an incomprehensible attribute of an incomprehensible substance, which for aught I know may be a totally different quality from that which I love and venerate—and even must, if Mr. Mansel is to be believed, be in some important particulars opposed to this—what do I mean by calling it goodness? and what reason have I for venerating it? If I know nothing about what the attribute is, I cannot tell that it is a proper object of veneration. To say that God's goodness may be different in kind from man's goodness, what is it but saying, with a slight change of phraseology, that God may possibly not be good? To assert in words what we do not think in meaning, is as suitable a definition as can be given of a moral falsehood. Besides, suppose that certain unknown attributes are ascribed to the Deity in a religion the external evidences of which are so conclusive to my mind, as effectually to convince me that it comes from God. Unless I believe God to possess the same moral attributes which I find, in however inferior a degree, in a good man, what ground of assurance have I of God's veracity? All trust in a Revelation presupposes a conviction that God's attributes are the same, in all but degree, with the best human attributes.

* * * * *

"Neither is this to set up my own limited intellect as a criterion of divine or of any other wisdom. If a person is wiser and better than myself, not in some unknown and unknowable meaning of the terms, but in their known human acceptation, I am ready to believe that what this person thinks may be true, and that what he does may be right, when, but for the opinion I have of him, I should think otherwise. But this is because I believe that he and I have at bottom the same standard of truth and rule of right, and that he probably understands better than I the facts of the particular case. If I thought it not improbable that his notion of right might be my notion of wrong, I should not defer to his judgment. In like manner, one who sincerely believes in an absolutely good ruler of the world, is not warranted in disbelieving any act ascribed to him, merely because the very small part of its circumstances which we can possibly know does not sufficiently justify it. But if what I am told respecting him is of a kind which no facts that can be supposed added to my knowledge could

make me perceive to be right ; if his alleged ways of dealing with the world are such as no imaginable hypothesis respecting things known to him and unknown to me, could make consistent with the goodness and wisdom which I mean when I use the terms, but are in direct contradiction to their signification ; then, if the law of contradiction is a law of human thought, I cannot both believe these things, and believe that God is a good and wise Being. If I call any being wise or good, not meaning the only qualities which the words import, I am speaking insincerely ; I am flattering him by epithets which I fancy that he likes to hear, in the hope of winning him over to my own objects. For it is worthy of remark that the doubt whether words applied to God have their human signification, is only felt when the words relate to his moral attributes ; it is never heard of in regard to his power. We are never told that God's omnipotence must not be supposed to mean an infinite degree of the power we know in man and nature, and that perhaps it does not mean that he is able to kill us, or consign us to eternal flames. The Divine Power is always interpreted in a completely human signification, but the Divine Goodness and Justice must be understood to be such only in an unintelligible sense." Pp. 101—4.

This is the doctrine, not merely of Cudworth and the Cambridge Platonists, but of John Howe the great Nonconformist theologian, and Richard Watson the Methodist master in divinity. To us it seems a pity that Mr. Mill should have marred the last paragraph we have quoted by adding, to complete it, a sentence in which he "surmises" that theologians who adopt Mr. Mansel's views as to the "inconceivability of the divine goodness," "are content that his goodness should be conceived only as inconceivable, because they are so often required to teach doctrines respecting Him which conflict irreconcilably with all goodness that we can conceive." A still greater pity do we presume to think it, that a philosopher of Mr. Mill's calibre, should, in a paragraph the omission of which, in the midst of the former of the two passages we have quoted, we have marked by asterisks, have allowed himself to use such language as we have now to quote :—

"If, instead of the 'glad tidings' that there exists a Being in whom all the excellencies which the highest human mind can conceive, exist in a degree inconceivable to us, I am informed that the world is ruled by a being whose attributes are infinite, but what they are we cannot learn, nor what are the principles of his government, except that 'the highest human morality which we are capable of conceiving' does not sanction them ; convince me of it, and I will bear my fate as I may. But when I am told that I must believe this, and at the same time call this Being by the names which express and affirm the highest

human morality, I say in plain terms that I will not. Whatever power such a being may have over me, there is one thing which he shall not do: he shall not compel me to worship him. I will call no being good, who is not what I mean when I apply that epithet to my fellow-creatures; and if such a being can sentence me to hell for not so calling him, to hell I will go."—P. 102.

Is it not too plain that there is temper in this paragraph, that it bears the brand upon it of the virulence with which unbelief too often regards theological doctrine? What need was there for such a paragraph? What is its relevance or fitness? Is it such as beseems a great calm critic and a philosopher? Had Mr. Mill, holding the views which he does, said that he could not regard such a conception of Deity as he has described as a conception of the true God, but rather as an image and idol set up by a futile, yet mischievous, theological dogmatism; an image and idol which those might worship who had set it up, but which he could never be induced to believe in; he would have said what, from his point of view, he might perhaps have been justified in saying; and he would have spoken quite as sharply as a profound and dispassionate philosopher is accustomed to speak. But the violence, the passion, the offensiveness with which in this unhappy passage he has expressed himself, are so needless and uncalled for, that we can hardly refrain from characterizing his language as indecent, and have no hesitation in condemning it as altogether unworthy of the large calm intelligence which is proper to such a philosopher as Mr. Mill.

We can carry no farther our review of the line of Mr. Mill's criticism on Sir W. Hamilton. So far, indeed, as respects the metaphysical speculations of Sir William, what has been already quoted or summarised will sufficiently indicate the strain of Mr. Mill's criticisms, and also our own views in respect to Sir William's characteristic tenets. Mr. Mill, in subsequent chapters, prosecutes his Examination in detail; but its grounds and its scope are not enlarged. Hamilton's definition and interpretation of consciousness, which brings up again his distinction between knowledge and belief, and the question of necessary beliefs and intuitive convictions; Hamilton's review of Theories on the Belief in an External World, in his examination of which Mr. Mill powerfully vindicates Brown from Hamilton's unsparing strictures; Hamilton's Doctrine of Unconscious Mental Modifications, with which, in good part, Mr. Mill agrees, although he frequently dissents from Sir William's arguments; his Theory of Causation; all pass under strict review. In the course of these criticisms

Mr. Mill discloses, to a considerable extent, his own counter-philosophy; and in the midst of them he throws in three chapters of the highest interest and importance, in which he exercises to the utmost his great powers of analysis, in unfolding and illustrating his own "psychological theory of belief in an external world;" in applying the principles of the same theory to account for our convictions in regard to the existence and powers of mind as well as matter—our own mind and other minds; and in explaining, at great length, the same theory as applied to the development of our ideas of the primary qualities of matter. This psychological theory would develop all our intellectual faculties, and all our primary convictions, intellectual and moral, out of the inseparable association of ideas. A material object is defined as the union or co-existence of certain "permanent possibilities of sensation." The theory aims to liquidate the distinction, as a distinction real and essential, not only between mind and matter, but between the ego and the non-ego, which we hold to be not precisely the same thing; it contemplates as its goal, were this but practicable, the resolution of mind itself into a continuous thread of sensations and ideas, but is confessedly restrained from reaching this goal, by the impossibility of thus resolving the sense of specific unity and identity in consciousness, revealed by the phenomena of memory. Nothing can be more thorough-going than the idealism, or more complete than the ontological scepticism, of this philosophy. It would empty the universe of reality and of faith. This is the philosophy, Mr. Mill's own philosophy, to which we must before long give our undivided attention in another article.

Mr. Mill's clearly defined and thoroughly consistent, nominalism appears to great advantage in the chapters in which he examines Hamilton's views respecting concepts or general notions, judgment, and reasoning. His examination of Sir William Hamilton's contributions to logical science and his "supposed improvements in formal logic" is complete and severe. He rejects entirely his claim to have added a new class of syllogisms, syllogisms in comprehension, to the previously recognised syllogisms in extension; he maintains that "the distinction between judgments in extension and judgments in comprehension is not sustainable;" and that "the supposed addition to the theory of the syllogism is a mere excrescence and incumbrance on it." And as to the "quantification of the predicate," on which many able writers have set so high a value, Mr. Mill pronounces as his final

sentence that "the utility of the new forms is by no means such as to compensate for the great additional complication which they introduce into the syllogistic theory;" that "the new forms have no practical advantage which can counter-vail their entire psychological irrelevancy; and the invention and acquisition of them have little value except as one among many other facts of mental gymnastic, by which students of the science may exercise and invigorate their faculties." "They should, in short," concludes Mr. Mill, "be dealt with as Sir W. Hamilton deals with Mr. De Morgan's forms of 'numerically definite' syllogism—viz., "taken into account by logic as authentic forms, but then relegated as of little use in practice, and cumbering the science with a superfluous mass of words" (p. 445).

Hamilton's "Theory of Pleasure and Pain," and his "Opinions on the Study of Mathematics," are reviewed in some of the latest chapters of the volume. Except that Mr. Mill can do nothing partially, and was evidently determined to present a complete estimate of the celebrated Scottish metaphysician and professor, we should hardly have thought it needful for him to devote a chapter to the refutation of Hamilton's singular and eccentric opinions respecting the study of mathematics. A singularity in Mr. Mill's own views as given in this volume is, that to Hamilton's resolution to hold by the doctrine of free will, he attributes, in part, his comparative failure as a philosopher. To this subject of "the Freedom of the Will" Mr. Mill devotes a chapter, on which it is not within our scope in this article to offer any remarks.

Mr. Mill frankly expresses his judgment that Mr. Mansel's doctrine respecting the nature of God, and our relations to a God unknown, is 'simply the most morally pernicious doctrine now current.' We do not agree with Mr. Mansel; we condemn the doctrine of his Lectures. But we think we can point to a doctrine which cannot be less morally pernicious than Mr. Mansel's, than which none indeed can be more morally pernicious. Mr. Mill treats the theistic faith with great respect throughout this volume. He assures his readers repeatedly that his philosophy does not at all trench upon the domain of theology; and that all the evidences on which the believer has been accustomed to rest, remain intact. But to us the case seems far otherwise. In our judgment, Mr. Mill's philosophy strikes at the root of all faith and all morality. If in another mundane system two and two might possibly make five, and two lines might enclose a space, or, at any rate, be universally believed so to do; surely there must be

an end to all certainty on all points. On Mr. Mill's principles there can be no necessary truth. With necessary truth "eternal and immutable morality" must vanish away. If in some other world two and two may make five; in some other world what we now regard as virtue may be vice, and our wrong may come forth there as right.

Mr. Mill is a man of rare ability; but his one string of sensation will not yield the tones and harmonies of moral truth and majesty to any magician, let him play upon it ever so deftly. Nor can mere inseparable association of ideas ever afford a basis for divine law; or, by any transmutation, become within us the voice of conscience. Why a thorough-going sceptic, like Mr. Mill, who, whether he can be called a fatalist or not, at any rate rejects utterly both the doctrine of Free Will, and, in any true sense, the authority of Conscience; and whose deepest basis of morality is only an enlarged and refined Benthamite utilitarianism; should employ the language of moral indignation, as in several places in this volume he does very emphatically, especially when criticizing Mr. Mansel; should speak as if moral responsibility were a great reality; we are unable to understand, on any principles of mere logical consistency. We have no doubt, however, that Mr. Mill's moral sense and sympathy, however defective in its foundation, is for himself at least an elevating reality, a true regulative power. We have long ago learnt not to judge a man's morals or his heart merely by his philosophy. Nevertheless, we cannot but feel that one main reason of his unsparing severity upon Sir W. Hamilton is, that Sir William built all his philosophy upon the basis of a moral consciousness; and, notwithstanding his obscurities and aberrations respecting the "philosophy of the conditioned," was livingly penetrated throughout all his thinking and teaching with a noble theistic faith and reverence.

This book of Mr. Mill's is, of course, the signal for the opening of a grand controversy. Before we resume the discussion which, in this article, we have barely entered upon, no doubt some chief of the Realist school will have appeared to do battle for "eternal and immutable morality," and for the fundamental convictions of our nature. A champion is needed, greatly needed. Professor Masson has been elected to the Chair of English Literature in Edinburgh; but assuredly his volume on Recent British Philosophy will not have added to the reputation with which he enters upon his labour. Slight throughout, in its dealing with Mill's Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy it is altogether feeble. In

the *North British Review*, which should represent the present phase of Realism in Scotland, an article has appeared which, professing to be a re-statement of the realistic controversy on behalf of a new variety of Realism—called Reflectic Realism—which may be regarded as the clarified and improved representative, or, for the present time, the virtual equivalent, of Hamilton's presentative philosophy, essays to reconcile Hamilton with Mill, by showing that Hamilton's philosophy was, no less than Mr. Mill's, fundamentally "a philosophy of nescience," and, in truth, all but capitulates to Mill on almost every critical point. Hitherto Mill has found no "foeman worthy of his steel." We observe, however, that Dr. McCosh is engaged in the preparation of a work which is to be a thorough reply to Mill. We await, with not a little expectation, the appearance of this volume; and shall, no doubt, be the better furnished, after its appearance, for the arduous task of reviewing Mr. Mill's own system of philosophy.

ART. VII.—1. *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates:*

2. *History of Europe, from the Commencement of the French Revolution in 1789, to the Restoration of the Bourbons in 1815.* By SIR ARCHIBALD ALISON, Bart. Blackwood.
3. *History of Europe from the Battle of Waterloo to the Accession of Louis Napoleon.* By SIR ARCHIBALD ALISON, Bart. Blackwood.
4. *Memoirs of the Court of England during the Regency, from Original Family Documents.* By the DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM AND CHANDOS. Hurst and Blackett.
5. *Memoirs of the Court of England during the Reign of George IV., from Original Family Documents.* By the DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM AND CHANDOS. Hurst and Blackett.
6. *A Portion of the Journal kept by Thomas Raikes, Esq., from 1831 to 1847.* Longman and Co.
7. *History of the Whig Ministry of 1830, to the Passing of the Reform Bill.* By JOHN ARTHUR ROEBUCK, M.P. J. W. Parker.

DURING the year which has just closed, two men were laid in the grave whose names will long live in history. They had the same object in view, but they pursued it by different roads. They were both patriots, but they were more than rivals; they were antagonists. The one thought that his country's welfare was best advanced by preserving her institutions unchanged, and that her honour was best sustained by making her influence felt in every part of the world; the other thought that there was need of organic reformation at home, and that only mischief ensued from interference abroad. They differed as widely as it was possible for two public men to differ in birth, education, and social position. The one was the descendant of a family that traced its lineage to a Saxon Earl, had for ancestors some of the most distinguished statesmen of past generations, and was himself heir to a peerage, brought up at a public school and two Universities, and all his life a member of that exclusive circle which constitutes the highest aristocracy; the other was the son of a yeoman, and himself a commercial traveller, without influence or connections, and with no other qualifications for public life

than shrewd sense and "unadorned eloquence." The first held office for more than half a century, and yet originated no one measure of importance with which his name will be associated; the other never held office for a day, and yet identified himself with two of the most beneficial measures of the present generation. The first was by the express command of his Sovereign honoured with a public funeral, and sepulchred with pomp at the Abbey where, fifty-nine years before, the two great rivals of that time had been laid in the grave; the second, as though he had been a simple country squire, was buried among the undistinguished dead of a Sussex village. Nor does the contrast end here. They fought long and nobly as Britons should fight, and the second, dying six months before the first, said of him, "he was always a very generous enemy"—words which deeply affected the survivor. But it is the victor who rests in the churchyard of Lavington; it is the vanquished who lies in Statesmen's Corner at Westminster. For, whether wisely or unwisely, whether for good or for evil, the doctrine of "non-intervention" has taken the place of "a spirited foreign policy," and it was this doctrine which Cobden preached all his life, and to which, before his death, after a life-long opposition to it, Palmerston yielded.

There is not, on reflection, anything surprising in the apparent injustice of the contemporaries of these two men. Lord Palmerston occupied a much more prominent position than Mr. Cobden; he was an active statesman for a much longer period, and his sphere of action was much more extensive than his antagonist's. True it is that the Anti-Corn-Law leader obtained distinction in his advocacy of free trade, and earned the gratitude of two nations by the Commercial Treaty with France. But for half a century Lord Palmerston was a more or less prominent member of successive English administrations, and one of the most influential parties to every foreign complication. When an English traveller for the first time was admitted to an audience with the Grand Llama of Thibet he was immediately asked about "Palmerston." With "Palmerston" Russian mothers used to terrify into silence their crying children. The name was known not only in every part of Europe, but throughout Asia, from the Dardanelles to Behring's Straits, from New Siberia to Singapore. It was dreaded by the slave-stealers of Africa, and respected even by the little-venerating citizens of the United States. It is associated with nearly every recent revolution on our own Continent, with not a few ignoble African con-

flicts, with many a Transatlantic controversy, and with the humiliation of the most ancient and most populous empire in Asia, indeed in the whole world. Without Palmerston the French Empire might not have been established, the independence of Belgium and the unification of Italy might not have been secured, and China and Japan would almost certainly have been barred against European commerce and ideas. As regards the area of operations, Cobden cannot compare with Palmerston. To the first this country is indebted for two beneficent measures; by the second, England's foreign policy has been moulded for the past thirty-five years, with all its influences for good or evil. A grateful nation will gladly inscribe the first name in the list of its benefactors. There is scarcely a civilised country in the world whose annals of the nineteenth century will not contain the name of the second.

We have said that Lord Palmerston was of ancient English lineage. The fact that he was only an Irish peer, has caused this circumstance to be generally overlooked. Nevertheless, the late Premier had older blood in his veins even than the Courtenays or the Stanleys, and his competitor for the premiership could not point to a genealogy so remote. The Temples did not "come over" with the Conqueror, for they were in England prior to the Conquest. Their ancestor was Algar, Earl of Mercia, one of the foremost nobles in the time of Edward the Confessor, and more notorious than illustrious for his treatment of his serf-subjects, and of his wife Godiva. His son was killed in defending himself against the Normans five years after the battle of Hastings. The son of this man was more fortunate. He appears to have so far regained for himself and his family the favour of the conquering dynasty, that he was allowed to take the title of Earl of Leicester and Coventry. He also assumed the name of Temple from the Manor of Temple at Wellesborough, Leicestershire, which had been given aforetime by his ancestors to the Knights Templars, who in turn conferred it upon the descendant of their benefactor. Passing over nearly five centuries, we come to a Peter Temple, who, *tempore* Edward VI., held the Manor of Stowe. He had two sons; John, from whom are descended maternally the Dukes of Buckingham and Chandos, and Anthony, the father of Sir William Temple, secretary to Sir Philip Sydney, and, after the decease of that English Bayard, to the unfortunate Earl of Essex. The fall of this favourite did not seriously affect Temple, and he was appointed Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, and Master in

Chancery. His son, John, held high office in Ireland, and, in spite of his connexion with Cromwell, retained some of his honours after the Restoration. He had two sons, the famous Sir William, an ornament alike to literature and to statesmanship, and Sir John, successively Solicitor-General, Attorney-General, and Speaker of Ireland. This Sir John had a son, Henry, who, on March 12, 1722, was created a peer of Ireland, in the dignities of Baron Temple and Viscount Palmerston. He, like so many other of the Temples, held office; and of this nobleman, Mr. Bernal Osborne, in his last speech to the subsequently ungrateful electors of Liskeard, made the following quotation, then very apposite to the existing political situation:—

“ One stanza more, and I have done :
May Heaven preserve Lord Palmerston ;
And since for life he's in,
We must, like others, stay
Till death, or his, or ours, shall pay
The wages of our sin.”

The Temples, indeed, seemed heaven-born statesmen, or, at least, office-holders. Of them Lord Macaulay says, in his brilliant essay on the brilliant Sir William, that the family “produced so many eminent men, and formed such distinguished alliances, that it exercised, in a regular and constitutional manner, an influence in the State scarcely inferior to that which, in widely different times, and by widely different arts, the House of Neville obtained in England, and that of Douglas in Scotland.” During the latter years of George II., and through the whole reign of George III., members of that widely-spread and powerful connexion were almost constantly at the head either of the Government or of the Opposition. There were times when the cousinhood, as it was once nick-named, would of itself have furnished almost all the materials for the construction of an efficient cabinet. “Within the space of fifty years, three First Lords of the Treasury, three Secretaries of State, two Keepers of the Privy Seal, and four First Lords of the Admiralty, were appointed from among the sons and grandsons of the Countess Temple. Later, the family was not so prolific of statesmen. Indeed, it is remarkable, that of the five wives of the three Viscounts Palmerston three died without issue. The first Viscount was succeeded by his grandson, Henry, the father of the late Premier, and who was born in 1739. He was married to Frances, daughter of Sir Francis Poole, and she died in childbirth, but without living issue, in 1769. The loss was

most keenly felt by the survivor; and his grief and resignation are shown in an epitaph of much beauty, which is to be seen in Romsey Abbey Church. It seems that he had taken his wife to the Hot Wells at Clifton in the hope of curing her, but that this measure was unavailing. "Ordained," says the mourner,

"to lose the partner of my breast,
Whose virtue warmed me, and whose beauty blest;
Framed every tie that binds the heart to prove
Her duty friendship, and her friendship love;
But yet remembering that the parting sigh
Appoints the just to slumber, not to die,
The starting tears I checked; I kiss the rod,
And not to earth resign her, but to God."

For thirteen years and a half Lord Palmerston remained a widower and childless. At length, in his forty-fourth year, on January 5, 1783, he contracted a second marriage. It has been stated, that this marriage was attended with romantic circumstances. It is said that Lord Palmerston was riding in Dublin, and that his horse falling, he suffered the fracture of one of his limbs, and was taken into the house of a hatter close by. There, the story continues, he received such kind attentions from the hatter's daughter, that after his recovery he made her his wife. The tale is probably untrue. The *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1783, states that Lord Palmerston was married at Bath, to "Miss Mary Mee, daughter of the late Benjamin Mee, Esq., and sister of Benjamin Mee, Esq., a Director of the Bank of England." However, it seems certain that Miss Mee was not of gentle birth, and that her children united in their veins plebeian blood with the oldest in the kingdom.

These children were four in number, Henry John, the statesman whose career we are about to trace, born October 20, 1784; William, afterwards a K.C.B., and Minister at the Neapolitan Court, who was born 1788, and died unmarried in 1856; Frances, married in 1820 to Captain, now Admiral Bowles; and Elizabeth, who was married in 1811 to Lawrence Sullivan, Deputy-Secretary-at-War, who died in 1837.

If we are to believe a contemporary magazine of some repute, the *Scotsman's*, it was at Park Street, Westminster, that the late Lord Palmerston first saw the light. Whether this be true or not, it was at Broadlands that he spent his childhood. This is a fine mansion, with Ionic portico, built by an architect named Brown, after the style popular in his day. Before it runs the river Test, which, passing

on, expands at length into Southampton Water. Just outside the park gates lies the little town of Romsey,—a town connected with the family of more than one statesman. It was at Romsey that there was born, about two centuries and a half ago, the son of a tailor, who not only himself became a knight, but was the ancestor of a marquis. It was the birth-place of Sir William Petty, and from this well-known surgeon, famous as the favourite of Charles II., and as the restorer to life of a woman who had been hanged, descended that Lord Henry Petty who beat Lord Palmerston at the Cambridge University election of 1806. Of Lord Palmerston's early childhood almost nothing is known. He was the eldest child, and was born twenty-one months after the marriage of his parents. His sister Frances, afterwards married to the present Admiral Bowles, was born the next year; his brother William in January, 1788, and his sister Elizabeth, afterwards the wife of Mr. Sullivan, in 1790. This constituted the whole family, and by the time that the youngest child had appeared her father was over fifty. He seems to have been a man of considerable taste, and helped to enrich Broadlands with many of those fine paintings which it now contains. The Temples were especially proud of their ancestor, the great Sir William, and there are at the present time not fewer than five portraits of this handsome statesman and man of letters. One of these portraits was an especial favourite with the late Premier, and was chosen by him as his model when dressing for a fancy ball. The mother of Lord Palmerston seems to have been benevolent and kind towards the poor. In the tablet erected to the memory of her eldest daughter, it is mentioned as one of the most commendable qualities of Mrs. Bowles, that her first object was to tread in the footsteps of her beloved and excellent mother, and "to maintain and improve all her institutions for the benefit of the poor." Whence it is clear that Lady Palmerston did not content herself with ordinary almsgiving, but laboured hard in devising plans for ameliorating the condition of her tenantry, after a fashion, which, if happily not unfrequent now, was rare in those days. Thus, we may picture the Palmerston family passing their days quietly and happily. The father a man of taste; the woman a Lady Bountiful; the sons acquiring a love for field sports, and, with the Ionic portico constantly before them, that love also for debased architecture which has unhappily deprived this country of one of the noblest buildings ever designed, inasmuch as it led Lord Palmerston to reject the plan for the new Government

offices, (which had been approved by his predecessor), on the ground that Italian was more cheerful than Gothic. Sunday by Sunday the party from Broadlands might be seen in Romsey Abbey Church, installed in a comfortable pew or dozing-pen as large as a room, where the future Premier, if he troubled himself about theology, had ample opportunity for conceiving strange theories about original sin, and for falling into the heresy of Pelagius, without having ever heard of it or of him. It may at first sight seem strange that the Lord Palmerston of that time did not enter upon political life. But, presuming that he inherited the family love for politics, of which we have no proof, he would, in spite of the great influence of his celebrated kinsman, William Wyndham Grenville, have had small opportunity for attaining office. He was an Irish peer, and until the Act of Union was passed, he could not have sat in the English Parliament. By the time that this became possible he was well on in years, and he died of a painful disease, described as "ossification of the throat," the year after the Union took effect. His wife survived him but three years, and the orphaned sons and daughters, the youngest of them being fifteen, and the eldest not yet twenty-one, erected a memorial to the parents, who had been deservedly loved; and thus the marble tablet in Romsey Abbey speaks of them:—

"To those who knew the tenour of their days,
 'Twere worse than needless to recount their praise;
 To those by whom their virtues were unknown,
 For cold applause the picture would be shown;
 And proud affection asks not for their bier
 The casual tribute of a stranger's tear.
 With aching bosoms and with bleeding hearts,
 We marked those sighs with which the spirit parts;
 Yet bowed submissive to the chastening rod,
 Nor dared to question the decrees of God.
 More blest to live, they die in Him to trust,
 He deals His mercies when He calls the just."

Of Lord Palmerston's school days, we have but scanty information. He went to Harrow in 1792 or 1793, and in the school list for 1796 his name stands first in the second remove of the fourth form. He is reputed, says a writer in a popular periodical, "to have been a merry, genial, good-humoured boy, with a fair complexion and curly hair, and to have been a general favourite among his school-fellows. The head master at that time was Dr. Joseph Drury, the man who raised Harrow to the proud position which it occupied at

the beginning of this century. He had been one of the assistant-masters, and was placed at the head of the school in 1785, the year after Lord Palmerston's birth. At one time during his mastership there were 350 names on the school list. The bill of 1803 shows a remarkable number of boys nobly born. Out of 345 names, there were those of one present and three prospective dukes, one future marquis, two actual and five future earls and viscounts, four others who bore the title of "lord," twenty-one "honourables," and four baronets. Rufus King, the American Minister, is said to have sent his two sons to Harrow, because at that school alone was no special honour attached to rank. Palmerston's schoolfellows were not only aristocratic, but many of them afterwards became illustrious. Peel was at the school when Palmerston was there, but was four years his junior, and was in a different boarding house. So that although the two did, according to the current tradition, "hit off" well together, they could scarcely have been intimate. Byron, with whom Palmerston's name has been associated, and for whom the late Premier is said to have entertained a strong aversion, could scarcely have come under his notice at all, since it was not until 1800 that the ringleader of the insurrection against Dr. Drury's successor entered the school; and it appears to have been in that year, at the latest, that Palmerston left Harrow. There is another tradition scarcely better founded than the others. It is that Palmerston was fag to Henry Law, afterwards Vicar of Standon, and whose son William was for some time Secretary to Lord Palmerston. Among his other schoolfellows were the late Earl of Aberdeen, the Earl of Ripon, Lord Chancellor Cottenham, and his brother Dr. Pepys, afterwards Bishop of Worcester, Earl Spencer, the Earl of Bessborough, the Right Hon. Sir W. Williams Wynn; and the Earls of Lonsdale and Onslow, Lord Roden, Sir Robert Shafto Adair, and the Rev. Augustus Campbell, Rector of Liverpool, who still survive him. In one sense of the word he certainly left a name behind him, and "H. Temple, 1800," is still to be seen legibly and finely carved upon one of the panels in the fourth-form room close by the names "B. Sheridan" and "Byron."* In after years it was Lord Palmerston's delight to ride down to Harrow on speech-days, and to point

* Palmerston's master was an elderly man named Bromley, who, from a likeness to one of the heathen gods which only a schoolboy's imagination could have discovered, was called "Old Pan." The most illustrious of his pupils did not foresee that he himself would be styled "Cupid," and in later life, by a *sobriquet* identical in all but the last letter (*m* being substituted for *n*) with Mr. Bromley's.

out to anyone who asked him the name that he had cut fifty or sixty years before. There was no old Harrovian so popular with modern Harrovians. As he came down the school steps he was always greeted with round upon round of ringing cheers, and he repaid them by listening with evident pleasure to the boys' recitations, in spite of the heat and crowd of the speech-room. Even when well advanced in years, he was sure to be present at the annual festival. He laid the foundation-stone of the School Library, and standing bare-headed in the pouring rain made the requisite speech; then looking up with a good-humoured smile and shrug of the shoulders said, "Knowledge is like these fertilising showers, and sometimes, as we know by experience, not very pleasant." At the same time, noticing that some of the boys had their hands upon the stone, he playfully made darts at them with his wooden mallet. It was on this occasion that he spoke of the present head-master as "Dr." Butler, and on being reminded that that gentleman was not a D.D., Palmerston, ever ready with a reply, turned to Mr. Butler, patted him on the back, and said, "Ah, well, none of us like to be doctored, do we?" On this, as on all similar occasions, he rode on horseback both to and from Harrow, without even taking a glass of wine. So young was he at seventy years both in body and mind.

From Harrow, Henry Temple went to Edinburgh, apparently in the year 1800. It was scarcely the place for a young Tory aristocrat. The Edinburgh aristocracy was an aristocracy of intellect, and that intellect was intensely Whig. It was while he was there that that memorable meeting took place in an eighth or ninth story flat in Buccleuch Place, between Sidney Smith and Francis Jeffrey, at which it was proposed to "set up a Review." It was while Temple was still attending Dugald Stewart's classes that the first number of the *Edinburgh Review* made its appearance, and established the fortunes of its originators. But the future Whig Premier of England held aloof from Jeffrey and Smith, and their friends Brown, Horner, Brougham, and Allen. They were needy men (Jeffrey had not long before married on less than a hundred pounds a-year, and furnished his house for under fifty pounds), and the Viscount's son moved in a different sphere. They were also, it must be added, somewhat his seniors. Nevertheless, even when he had an opportunity of meeting them, and all the other distinguished men whom Edinburgh at that time possessed, men of the calibre of Walter Scott, Erskine, and Dugald Stewart, he did not avail himself of it. He was

never a member of the "Speculative Society,"—which, originated before the late Premier's birth, has recently attained to its centenary. Nor was he a member of the "Friday Club," that "weekly meeting of all the literary and social persons in the city," which Scott started. It is not easy to imagine how he spent his time in the Modern Athens. Yet, if we are to trust his own statement, the three years that he passed there were not lost. He declared in after life that he learnt more at Edinburgh than he did at Cambridge. Certainly to have been the pupil of Dugald Stewart was no small advantage, and there are indications that Lord Palmerston profited by the lectures of this brilliant professor. It was while he was at Edinburgh that his father died, and that he succeeded to the family honours. Shortly afterwards he went to Cambridge, and was entered as a nobleman at St. John's College, then under the mastership of Dr. Craven. His admission is dated April 4th, 1803, and he went into residence the following October. One of his tutors was Mr. Wood, who afterwards became Master of the College, and then Dean of Ely. Lord Palmerston was not the idle man at Cambridge that he has been described. The fact that he became a candidate for the representation within a few months of his coming of age, and that he polled a considerable number of votes, proves that he must have attained a good position in the University. As a matter of fact, he obtained the second place in the first class in the college examinations for June, 1804, the Fourth Wrangler for 1807, and Junior Chancellor's Medallist being first, and the Senior Wrangler standing two below Lord Palmerston in these examinations. In June, 1805, his name is still to be found as a prizeman in the first class, though on this occasion in the eighth place. He was a fair scholar, but apparently had little love for the favourite study at Cambridge, and it was probably because he was no mathematician that he contented himself with an ordinary degree. Among the men who took high honours while he was at St. John's, were the late Bishops Kaye of Lincoln and Turton of Ely, Senior Wranglers in 1804 and 1805, the present Chief Baron Pollock, Senior Wrangler and first Smith's Prizeman, in 1806, and the late Bishop Monk, of Gloucester and Bristol. Not one of these dignitaries, however, owed his elevation to his former fellow-student, for all of them had received their promotion, and two of them had died, before the ecclesiastical patronage, of which the late Premier had so large a share, came into his hands.

It is somewhat remarkable that, while the second Lord Palmerston abstained from public life, his son should, even

in early youth, have made politics his profession, and have adhered to it throughout his long career. Doubtless there was at that time plentiful attraction to an ardent or ambitious mind, or to a young man brought up amongst public men. But Lord Palmerston was not particularly ambitious or ardent, and certainly had seen far less of the political world than might have been expected of a Temple. Nevertheless he was but four months past the attainment of his majority, when he offered himself to the learned and reverend doctors and masters of his University, as a fit and proper person to represent them in Parliament. It was, to use the mildest word, a bold thing to do. The seat which he sought to fill had just before been occupied by Pitt, and while the country was mourning the loss of her great minister, this boy sought to console the mourners by taking that minister's place. And at what a time he did this! The pilot had gone from the helm just as the rising waves and darkening sky had made his guidance more than ever needful. The glory of Trafalgar had been eclipsed by the thunder-cloud of Austerlitz. Men wept when they saw their gallant sailor laid to rest beneath the dome of St. Paul's. They had far greater cause to weep when their great statesman was entombed in the transept of the Abbey. Nelson had fallen in the hour of victory; Pitt had succumbed to a crushing defeat. The blood by which England's supremacy of the seas had been established, seemed to have been shed in vain, now that the French usurper had established his supremacy on the Continent. Nelson, sure of success, might say, "England expects every man to do his duty." Pitt had done his, and yet his last words were a groan, "My country! Oh, my country!" So the funeral that had been the apotheosis of a victorious hero, had been followed in about three months by the funeral that seemed to be the burial alike of England's leader and England's glory. Scarcely had the echoes of the herald's words, *non sibi, sed patriæ vixit*, died away around the aisles of Westminster, than he who has just been laid there made known to all whom it concerned that he was ready to take the place of "the great commoner." At all events, Palmerston followed Pitt's example in beginning his political career betimes, and indeed exactly in the same way, for Pitt had offered himself to the same constituency at the same age. Moreover, as to age there was very little to choose between him and his opponents. He had two rivals, who in the next generation became his colleagues. Both were destined to become Chancellors of the Exchequer in a Whig government. Neither was much older

than himself. They were Lord H. Petty, afterwards the Marquis of Lansdowne, and the Nestor of the Whigs, aged twenty-six, and Lord Althorp, afterwards Earl Spencer, and founder of the Royal Agricultural Society, aged twenty-four. Thus the united ages of the three candidates fell short of the age even of the present Premier. Clearly the time for octogenarian ministers was not yet. England in the time of her life and death struggle was better pleased to be "governed by a boy," and so youths not far on in the twenties were her Secretaries of State and her premiers. As for Palmerston, the dons took a fancy to him. He had done fairly in the examinations, and was believed capable of taking a higher position in the schools than he had chosen to take. He was a very decent classic; a by no means despicable pugilist, as the bargees of the Cam could testify; a good-looking gentlemanly young aristocrat, by no means bumptious, but both modest and cautious in the expression of his political opinions. Nevertheless he was not to be the winner of this round. Like his great predecessor in this, as in the other circumstances of his first election, he was at the bottom of the poll. The three candidates stood in the order of their ages. Lord Henry Petty polled 331 votes; Lord Althorp, the second Whig, 145; and Lord Palmerston, the only Conservative, 128.

The death of Pitt had brought on a ministerial crisis. The great minister had not cared to bring forward men of ability, and when he died there was not one member of his administration capable of carrying it on. Lord Hawkesbury was commissioned by the king to make the attempt; but that nobleman soon found it hopeless, and recommended his sovereign to send for Lord Grenville. The king was in a good humour at that time, and not only did as he was advised, but gave Lord Grenville to understand that he should no longer insist upon the exclusion of Mr. Fox, which he had hitherto made an essential condition of any arrangement. So after the usual amount of delay, and after negotiations with divers leading men, the new ministry was formed, and from the high attainments of most of its members, was nicknamed "All the Talents." It was a coalition of parties, and, containing a most illustrious array of names, bid fair to be lasting. Lord Grenville was Premier; Mr. Fox, Foreign Secretary and Leader of the House of Commons; Lord Erskine, Lord Chancellor; Lord Henry Petty, Chancellor of the Exchequer; Earl Fitzwilliam, Lord President. Lord Spencer went to the Home Office, Mr. Wynne and Mr. Windham to the War Office, and Mr. Sheridan became Treasurer of the

Navy. The fair promise which this splendid phalanx of statesmen gave was soon overclouded. The negotiations for peace with France failed; and shortly afterwards, within seven months from the death of his great rival, Fox too sank beneath the cares of office; but, more happy than Pitt, his last words were, "I die happy." Lord Howick succeeded Fox at the Foreign Office, and other changes took place in the administration. Immediately after these had been made, the ministers, greatly to the surprise of every one, dissolved Parliament, and a general election took place at the close of 1806. Lord Palmerston offered himself as a candidate for the representation of Horsham. This close borough then returned two members, and his colleague was Lord Fitzharris, who had been a member of Pitt's last administration. They received twenty-nine votes each, while their Whig opponents polled forty-four. The defeated candidates protested against the election on the ground of some illegality committed by the other side, and the returning officer thereupon made a double return. This election is said to have given rise to a pamphlet from Singleton Copley, afterwards Lord Lyndhurst, the only work whose authorship he could ever be induced to acknowledge. The unsuccessful candidates petitioned the House of Commons in vain. Colonel Wilde and Lieutenant Jones were declared duly elected, and Lord Palmerston took refuge in the nomination borough of Bletchingley, Surrey, which was disfranchised by the Reform Bill.

The Grenville Cabinet did not long survive the death of its most brilliant member. The event which led to its downfall was the old grievance between the king and his ministers. They, alarmed at the condition of Ireland, had brought in a bill styled the "Roman Catholic Army and Navy Service Bill," which proposed to admit Roman Catholics to serve in the defence of their country. But even this concession George III. would not listen to, and he forced his ministers to abandon the measure. He did more. He attempted to extort from them, as he had before extorted from Pitt, a promise that they would never press the subject upon him again. This promise, with Ireland on the verge of a rebellion, they could not as honourable and conscientious men give, and so they resigned. The Duke of Portland undertook to form the new administration, and on March 25, 1807, its completion was announced. Lord Eldon returned to the woolsack; Canning, after having long held a subordinate place, was made Foreign Secretary; Lord Castlereagh went to the War Office; and Perceval became Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Among the subordinate officials was the young Lord Palmerston, who, at a little over two-and-twenty, was made Junior Lord of the Admiralty.

The new ministers having obtained a majority of only thirty-four on an important debate in the House of Commons, they determined to appeal to the country against the Parliament which had been elected under the influence of their opponents. The dissolution took place on April 27th, and thus arose the almost unprecedented occurrence of two general elections in the course of six months. Lord Palmerston once more came forward at Cambridge. On this occasion, there were two other Conservatives besides himself; the old member, the Earl of Euston, and Sir Vicary Gibbs, the legal adviser of the unhappy Princess of Wales. Lord Palmerston, contrary to his own judgment, was induced to coalesce with the latter. The result was that he was beaten by a small majority, the numbers being: for the Earl of Euston, 324; for Sir Vicary Gibbs, 313; and for Lord Palmerston, 310. The last had, however, the satisfaction of beating his old antagonist, Lord Henry Petty, who, on this occasion, received but 265 votes. Like Pitt again in his early career, Palmerston, defeated at Cambridge, resorted to a nomination borough, that of Newport, Isle of Wight.

The new ministry soon found themselves with plenty of work upon their hands, and that not of a pleasant kind. Fox, who had hoped to restore peace, was during his short tenure of office so convinced that this was impracticable, that upon his dying bed he besought his colleagues to continue the war with vigour. This the new ministry were quite resolved to do, and in carrying out their resolve they resorted to an act of violence which only the supremest necessity could justify. By the victory of Jena, Prussia lay at the mercy of Bonaparte, who, entering Berlin, issued the memorable decrees by which all the nations of Europe were forbidden to trade with England. The King of Prussia retreated to, and was besieged in, Königsberg; and held out in the hope of assistance from Russia. That hope was dispersed by the battle of Friedland, in which the Russians were utterly defeated with enormous loss. Then followed the famous interview on the "raft of Tilsit" in the river Niemen; and after a fortnight's negotiations the two Treaties of Tilsit, whose conditions, formidable as they were to most of the European Powers, were insignificant compared with the "Secret Convention" made between the French and Russian Emperors. By this convention, the Continent was for the most part divided between Napoleon

and Alexander, and was to be arrayed in one gigantic coalition against England. Great as were the precautions to conceal these arrangements, they were speedily revealed to our Government. A certain individual, whose name for obvious reasons was not revealed, contrived to conceal himself in such a manner that he could overhear the arrangements of the two sovereigns. He lost no time in communicating them to Canning, who thus learnt that it was determined to force the Northern Powers into the alliance against England, and to make use of their fleets to blockade our ports. The danger was imminent and desperate, and there seemed no way of escaping from it but by anticipating the intentions of the two Emperors. Swiftly therefore an expedition was sent under Admiral Gambier and Lord Cathcart to Copenhagen. They demanded the surrender of the Danish fleet on the ground that Napoleon intended to seize it and use it against England. The result is well known. The English ministry had purposely made the expedition so strong that the Prince of Denmark might fairly say that he was compelled to submit to overwhelmingly superior force. Nevertheless he at first refused, and it became necessary to bombard the capital for three days before he could be induced to yield. At the end of that time he submitted, and before Admiral Gambier could receive instructions from England, he had made better terms than Canning would have ventured to ask. Every ship of the Danish fleet and all the stores and naval material passed into our possession. On the other hand, it was stipulated that our forces should evacuate the Danish territory in six weeks. Thus before our great enemy had time to prevent this frustration of his plans they were defeated, and England was delivered from the most terrible danger to which she had been exposed.

But if the condition was critical, the remedy was desperate; and Canning and his colleagues felt that it needed justification. Accordingly, the king issued a manifesto explaining the circumstances under which the fleet of a prince, with whom we were at peace, was forcibly seized and his capital bombarded. Party spirit at this time ran so high, that even if the Opposition had been convinced of the necessity of the measure, they would still have made it an occasion for attacking the Government which ordered it. The ensuing session witnessed repeated attacks upon the ministry. At the outset they took the form of demand for papers, like the attack with reference to the Danish Question of 1864. This demand was at first refused, but subsequently partially conceded. The chief debate took place on February 3, 1808. It was opened

by Mr. Ponsonby, satirized in the "New Whig Guide," who made a speech very inadequate to the occasion. Canning made one of his finest orations. He commenced with a stinging sarcasm. "The moment has at length arrived," he said, "when the gentlemen of the Opposition, peculiarly qualified by their own splendid achievements to inquire into the conduct of their successors, had by a worthy selection of the right honourable gentleman who had just sat down, put His Majesty's ministers upon their trial for that which, until questioned by them, had been considered the salvation of the country. In the greatness of his apprehension lest all moral impressions should be effaced from the minds of the House, the right honourable gentleman had taken a course which afforded a brilliant example of a morality—not only out of the ordinary track, but more severe even than that Roman morality which he knew had its admirers upon that bench. His Majesty's ministers were called to account, not for disaster or disgrace. They had been called upon to answer an accusation of success, to explain the elements and justify the motive of a service successfully performed. Whatever might be the decision of the House, he, for one, should always feel the highest satisfaction at being so accused. It was also a source of gratification that no imputation could rest upon the honourable gentleman opposite of being actuated by party feelings, as had sometimes happened when the successors of an administration had been left in possession of a glory which they had dilapidated. No envious feelings of compassion could have instigated the present motion. When nothing had been done by one set of men, it was impossible to compare their actions with what had been done by another." Such was the exordium of a masterly speech which lasted for three hours. Windham replied to it. He contended that if the Danish fleet was to be taken, it was better that Bonaparte should have taken it than we. He asserted that the ministers had been actuated by a vulgar fear, and had thereby destroyed the hopes of those nations which looked to England as their deliverer from the reign of fraud and violence. He then drew an eloquent description of the feelings with which the Danes must look upon their bombarded capital: "What shall we think when we find we have created the hatred of nations for generations to come, who will constantly remember our misdeeds when they behold the monuments of our ravages, when they point at the sad memorials of their destruction, when they see the remains of their public edifices, of that beautiful church which was

the pride of their capital, an awful ruin, when the recollection of our bombardment is perpetuated by the melancholy sentiments inspired by the eternity of the tomb? The church may fall, but the ruins will remain . . . A patriotic Dane will leave his money not to build, but to keep in repair the ruins we have made, to excite the recollection of the transaction, and the abhorrence of this country for the injury done to Denmark by its Government."

Shortly after this brilliant bit of declamation, Lord Palmerston rose and delivered his maiden speech. He said, "After the very brilliant and unanswered speech of the Secretary of State (Canning), and the insufficiency of the reply, it was not necessary for him to trouble the House at any length on the subject under discussion. He should set out with stating that he conceived it improper to disclose the information which ministers had received upon the subject, because their honour was pledged to secrecy. Disclosure would also destroy future sources of information. Besides, what necessity existed for producing such documents? It might be necessary to vindicate the conduct of ministers, but unquestionably the present position of Europe, and the vassalage to which its sovereigns were reduced, offered unfortunately too ready and solid a reason for the adoption of such a course." He went on to say, "The present expedition is defensible on the ground that the enormous power of France enables her to coerce the weaker state to become the enemy of England. The right honourable gentleman (Mr. Windham) has urged that we have been guilty of a violation of the law of nations. Sir, no man could be more ready than I to respect the law of nations, but the question in this case is how to apply the admitted principle, that the law of nations is sacred. It is one thing to admit the right of nations, another to succumb to the policy which may for the time govern them. A nation coerced by a superior power loses that independence which is the plea for its rights, and the guarantee of their maintenance by mankind. In the case now before the House, the law of nature is stronger even than the law of nations. It is to the law of self-preservation that England appeals for the justification of her proceedings. It is admitted by the honourable gentleman and his supporters, that if Denmark had evinced any hostility towards this country, we should have been justified in measures of retaliation. How, then, is the case altered, when we find Denmark acting under the coercion of a power notoriously hostile to us? . . . Denmark coerced into hostility, stands in the same position as Denmark voluntarily

hostile, when the law of self-preservation comes into play. We must remember what has been the conduct of France towards other countries, and if we would preserve the blessings of a free constitution, we must not judge this Government by a barren and abstract rule of justice, but by those large and more free principles which regulate the conduct of nations in great emergencies." The debate was continued with great animation; the more so, as some of the usual supporters of the Government rose to announce that on this occasion they must vote against ministers. At length, at five o'clock in the morning, the House divided, when there were for Mr. Ponsonby's motion 108, and against it, 253. Thus, in spite of some defections, there was a good ministerial majority of 145, or more than two to one.

The Portland administration, like its immediate predecessors, was destined to a short life. The Premier became seriously ill, and his friends insisted upon his resignation. Canning had reason to complain of the manner in which the war was carried on, and endeavoured to get a portion of Castlereagh's duties transferred to himself, or, failing that, to have his colleague removed. Then came the miserable Walcheren expedition; and at last the dissensions in the cabinet became so fierce, that it was broken up, and Canning and Castlereagh fought a duel. It was more than usually murderous, for the combatants, not content with firing the customary single shot each, which was then considered necessary to heal wounded honour, fired a second time, as though assassination, and not vindication, were their real object. The Duke of Portland having resigned, Canning hoped to have taken his place. To this the other members of the cabinet would not consent. They determined to select a man who was not a partisan of either of the hostile colleagues, and Mr. Perceval was made Premier, after fruitless overtures to Lord Grenville and Lord Grey. As Canning positively refused to serve under Perceval, he resigned, and the Marquis Wellesley, then ambassador at Madrid, was recalled and placed at the Foreign Office. The Earl of Liverpool succeeded Lord Castlereagh at the War Office, and Lord Palmerston was transferred from the Admiralty and made Secretary-at-War. There is no need for us to enter into the vexed question of Canning's conduct in this matter. He has been accused of conspiring and undermining in order to get the Premiership; charges against which his biographer, Mr. Stapleton, protests. Yet even his personal friend and fellow-minister, George Rose, was compelled to come to the conclusion that Canning had acted wrongly, and

for that reason decided not to resign with him. As for Lord Palmerston, he, though always an admirer of the great minister, and in a great measure his disciple, was never so closely attached to him as to share his fortunes when they became adverse. Nor did he eighteen years later feel any difficulty in joining the administration whose members were charged with having worried Canning to death. The circumstances connected with his appointment have been differently narrated. It is stated by Mr. Plumer Ward, that Lord Palmerston had said three posts were offered him: a seat at the Treasury, by way of introduction to the Seals; the Chancellorship of the Exchequer; and the Secretaryship, which he actually accepted. A recent and clearly well-informed writer* gives rather a different version of the matter, which also came from Lord Palmerston himself. According to this version, Perceval sent for Lord Palmerston, and said he had a curious proposal to make. He had offered the Chancellorship of the Exchequer to Mr. Milnes (the father of Lord Houghton), and he wished to know whether, if Mr. Milnes declined the office, Lord Palmerston would take it. The last replied that he must consult his friends. They advised him to give a negative reply, inasmuch as finance was not his line, and failure might ruin his political prospects. He declined accordingly, and at the same time was told that the Secretaryship of War had been offered to Mr. Milnes, and a similar question to the former one was asked. That post Lord Palmerston did take. This story, although proceeding from a writer who clearly was acquainted with the late Premier, offers difficulties which Mr. Plumer Ward's account does not. The fact that Mr. Perceval himself was at that time, and continued to be Chancellor of the Exchequer, renders it improbable that he should have made the offer to Mr. Milnes and Lord Palmerston which he is by the writer in *Fraser's Magazine* reported to have made.

The young minister now found himself fairly embarked in the profession which he had chosen, and to which, in spite of several defeats, he had adhered. The year following his appointment to the War Office, he attained another object of his ambition. In 1811 the Duke of Grafton died, and his son, the Earl of Euston, succeeding his father in the peerage, vacated his seat for the University of Cambridge. There is said to be good luck in the number three; and so it proved on this the third occasion. Two Conservatives appeared for the representation, and at the close of the poll they stood as

* See *Fraser's Magazine*, Nov. 1865.

follows: Lord Palmerston 451, Mr. John Henry Smyth 345. This seat the winner continued to hold for twenty years, although not always without a contest. Thus the young nobleman, whose appointment to a post under government was at first treated as a joke by his old friends in Cambridge Combination Rooms, fairly established his reputation as that of a safe and creditable representative. Brilliant he was not. Great as had been the promise of his maiden speech, it was long before that promise was fulfilled. One may look through volume after volume of "*Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*," and few will be found to be the figures appended in the index to the name of Palmerston. Even the few references which there are will show how rarely and how little he spoke. If we were to judge by the almost invariable preface which he used when he did speak—"It is not my intention to trespass upon the attention of the House,"—we might suppose him to have been a bore, deprecating manifestations of impatience preparatory to the infliction of a long-winded oration. But Palmerston was so rare a speaker that Henry Brougham twitted the Secretary-at-War because his voice was so seldom heard in the House. To this Palmerston replied, that he could not return the compliment. Year by year he used to move the Army Estimates, and the Committee, gratified by the fulfilment of his promise to be brief, used to praise him in a patronising way for his "*perspicuity*." *Perspicuous* he may have been, but he was undeniably dry. Although he was in the House of Commons the ministerial representative of the War Department (the chief minister being in the House of Lords), and had therefore splendid opportunities to dilate upon the achievements of our great military hero, he was on only one occasion moved into eloquence, and this was when making his first speech as mouthpiece of the War Office. This was on February 26th, 1810, and he thus concluded his speech, in words that have so completely the Palmerston ring, that they might have been delivered fifty years later: "Our military force is at this moment as efficient in discipline as it is in numbers; and this is not only in the regular army, but in the militia, volunteers, and other descriptions of force. We have 600,000 men in arms, besides a navy of 200,000. The masculine energies of the nation were never more conspicuous, and the country never at any period of its history stood in so proud and glorious a position as at present. After a conflict for fifteen years, against an enemy whose power has been progressively increasing, we are still able to maintain the war with augmenting force, and a popu-

lation, by the pressure of external circumstances, consolidated into an impregnable military mass. Our physical strength has risen when it has been asked for, and if we do not present the opposition of numerous fortresses to the invaders, as the Continent does, we present the more insuperable barrier of a high-spirited, patriotic, and enthusiastic people." In one respect this speech was different from those of his latter years. Half a century after this he had learned to discredit Campbell's boast that "Britannia needs no bulwarks, no towers along the steep," and in spite of strong opposition in Parliament, and even in his own cabinet, he succeeded in committing the country to costly works of defence, which long before they were finished are pronounced useless.

Among the questions connected with his department, upon which Palmerston had to speak, were the proposal to relieve officers from the payment of income-tax, and that to abolish flogging in the army. To the first he objected, on the favourite ground of financiers, that if one class of public servants were excepted, other classes would demand the same privilege. He opposed the yearly motion for the repeal of that part of the Mutiny Act which gives military officers power to order corporal punishment, on the ground that flogging was really a merciful provision, since without it many a man who had been subjected to it would have been ordered for execution. It also fell to Palmerston to defend the notorious "Peterloo" massacre, which he did with tolerable success.

The few and for the most part dry speeches which the young minister delivered during the first twenty years of his political life, give but a faint insight into the times. These were full of political intrigue, court scandal, and royal profligacy. Virtuous as King George and Queen Charlotte were, they had not the art of training up children in the way that they should go. The dogmatism of the one parent, and the sordidness of the other, had the natural effect of making their sons rebellious and extravagant. The young princes had countless amours, boundless debts, constant quarrels. It required the stern trials of a tremendous war to keep the national morals from putrefaction; and when the war was over, society was reduced to a state of decomposition, from which, happily for England and the world, there was a palingenesis. England was brought far nearer to national destruction in the years between the battle of Waterloo and the Reform Bill, than she had been by the tyranny of the first Charles, or by the licentiousness of the second. Fortunately, there had since those days grown up a power which

no British sovereign can resist, the power of Public Opinion, and that enforced at least an outward respect for public morals, and a practical concession to public rights.

Soon after Lord Palmerston commenced his public career, there were three rival courts in England. There was the court at Windsor, where the mad king was kept under the charge of his penurious wife, who out of the money voted for her husband's maintenance, saved enough to furnish her own house in town. Then there was the court at Carlton House, which claimed to be the court *par excellence*. The appointments of this establishment were splendid, and the *fêtes* oriental in magnificence and extravagance. On one occasion the dinner table extended across the whole of Carlton House, and through the conservatory, 200 feet in length, and along the centre of the table was a canal of water flowing from a silver fountain, and filled with brilliant-tinted fish. Behind the Prince was a gorgeous collection of plate and jewels. Sixty servitors attended upon the guests, who prolonged the banquet until six of the following morning. They consisted of all the members of the Government, of the foreign ministers, and of all the distinguished nobility. This illustrious company assembled within a few weeks after their host had announced, with seeming sorrow, that his father had been visited with the direst affliction that can befall a man. At other times, there was less splendour and more conviviality. The Regent was "very good company," and so were his familiar friends, and they had peculiar tastes, a taste for wine amongst the rest. So that when the next morning came, and the head of the nation was waited upon by his ministers to transact national business, he would send word to them that he could not see them, because he was "so drunk last night." The third court was that of the Princess of Wales, at Kensington Palace. This was for a time well attended, albeit the hostess did not bring "airs from Araby the blest." Byron and Scott were to be found there, and Lord Melbourne, Sir William Gell, Lady Caroline Lamb, and Lady Charlotte Campbell. But at last the coarse manners, dirty person, and dirtier talk of the royal mistress, drove away her friends. Even the men who afterwards espoused her cause, did so, not because it was a good one, but because it afforded them an opportunity of attacking the Government, and making political capital. There might be said to be a fourth court, that of the Princess Charlotte, at Warwick House. The Princess was a girl of considerable personal attractions, and it is to her credit that her mother's systematic ill-teaching

did not ruin her. Fortunately for her happiness she came into good hands, Prince Leopold of Saxe Coburg, whom the Austrian Archduchesses had not thought worthy of their hands, and who became the husband of the heiress to the English throne by her own free-will and choice. The country rejoiced in their union; rejoiced still more when it was announced that there was likely to be fruit of it. The Princess herself, a few days before her confinement, said that she had now everything that heart could wish for, and that such happiness was too great to last. So, alas, it proved; and shortly after Lord Eldon and the two other ministers of state had left the doctors discussing what bulletin they should issue respecting the health of the mother and the babe, they were roused by the woeful tidings that the Princess was dead.

The warfare between the courts at Carlton House and Kensington came to a crisis when the Regent forbade his wife to attend the drawing-rooms, and, acting upon the precedent of George II. after the death of Queen Caroline, himself received the ladies who desired to pay their respects to their Sovereign. The Princess protested, and wrote letters full of execrable English to her husband and to Queen Charlotte, who took very little notice of them. Then she set out for Geneva, Milan, Genoa, Como, and everywhere she conducted herself with the utmost indecorum. Now she danced at a public ball with Sismondi, "dressed à la Venus," or, in plainer language, naked from the waist upwards. Now she would go out driving with an Italian minion and favourite, "six feet high, with a magnificent head of black hair, pale complexion, and mustachios that will reach from here (Genoa) to London," as Lady Charlotte Campbell describes "the stork." At last the Prince would bear her improprieties no longer, and insisted upon a divorce. The "Milan Commission," with all its scandalous revelations followed. The final breach was, however, postponed for a little. The Regent was very ill, so that it seemed doubtful if he would survive his imbecile father. Then occurred within the course of one week the death of the Duke of Kent, and of the King, and then ministerial intrigues and embarrassments. The determination of George IV. to omit the name of his Queen from the Liturgy, brought the quarrel to a climax. Characteristically she made an irreverent jest when she heard that she was not to be prayed for, and characteristically also she proceeded to take measures of revenge. She declared that she would return to England, and heavy were the bets laid at the clubs about her arrival. Many a frequenter of St. James's Street declared

himself willing to pay a guinea a day until she came, provided that he were paid fifty guineas when she did come, so confident were most persons that the Queen would fulfil her threat. She did arrive. All England turned out to meet her, and to escort her to a London alderman's house in South Audley Street. Day by day the people thronged the streets and shouted themselves hoarse when "a stout lady in a large hat and plume of feathers" showed herself at the window. Ministers brought in a bill to settle the matter by bringing the Queen to trial; and during its progress, the excitement increased, and it became evident that if she were arraigned at Westminster Hall, half London would accompany her, and if she were found guilty—all beyond that was a vision of fearful tumult and revolution. So when the bill passed its third reading in the Upper House, by a majority of only nine, ministers made the smallness of the majority an excuse for abandoning the measure; and London straightway burst forth into a blaze of illuminations. The triumph was short-lived. The people got tired of the "stout lady," and thought so little of her reputation, that her most ardent supporters repudiated with expressions of pious horror the idea of sending their wives and daughters to Brandenburg House. The flagging sympathy was aroused again when the Queen in vain sought admission into the Abbey at the coronation of her husband, and when a few days later she died almost suddenly, and perhaps partly of chagrin, she became a martyr in public estimation, and was canonised in the public calendar. When this event happened, George IV. was on a visit to Ireland, but he had sufficient sense of decorum to postpone his public entry into Dublin until after his wife's burial. That over, the royal widower emerged from his brief seclusion, and was received with that extravagant enthusiasm which the Irish always display when visited by royalty. Shortly afterwards, the king paid a visit to Hanover, where, though he got a hearty reception from his German subjects, he soon got bored by the processions of parishioners carrying their Bibles under their arms, and singing "exquisite hymns." He soon returned to England. Here there was little that was pleasant to greet him.

The state of the country at this time was truly alarming. Ministers persistently refused to grant any reforms, and turned a deaf ear alike to the demands for civil enfranchisement and for religious freedom. The consequence was that they scarcely dared to show themselves. Lord Sidmouth, the Home Secretary, was especially obnoxious. He never drove

out without taking a brace of pistols loaded for instant use, and, being in his carriage one night, had its windows broken with the stones hurled by a furious mob who scarcely let him escape with life. The other ministers were groaned at and hooted whenever they appeared, and were frequently compelled to have the escort of life guards. When the suicide of Lord Castlereagh was published, there was general rejoicing, and the mob insulted the mourners as his body was taken from the hearse into the Abbey. An additional cause of discontent arose in the incessant prosecutions for sedition which were urged upon Lord Eldon by the King himself. There was, moreover, wide-spread distress; and those persons who hoped that trade would revive after the close of the war, found that while those branches of industry promoted by the war declined, other branches were in no way improved. Last of all, it was well known that the King was under the influence of female favourites, especially of a notorious Marchioness, from whom he was almost inseparable, and who intrigued with, or against, the various political parties. The King's unpopularity increased as his maladies increased, and rendered him averse from appearing in public. He spent much of his time at Brighton, in that architectural monstrosity, which led Wilberforce to declare that the dome of St. Paul's had come down to the sea-side, and had left there a litter of cupolas; and which gave point to Lord Eldon's ill-natured joke about Edward Irving, that all the world was rushing to hear a "Presbyterian orator" at a "schism shop" in Hatton Garden, *the* Marchioness among the rest, and that whenever Irving saw her to be present, he altered the words "heavenly mansions," which were good enough for other hearers, into "the heavenly pavilion." Such is no exaggerated picture of society during the Regency. May we never look upon its like.

At this period, Lord Palmerston was a man of fashion, without political ambition. Tall, and tolerably handsome, and with engaging manners, he was a favourite with the ladies, and obtained for himself the *sobriquet* of "Cupid," which stuck to him until a very recent date. He could afford to laugh at those who laughed at him, for he obtained admission into that temple of fashion whence at least ninety-nine out of every hundred applicants for entry were sent away mortified and angry. Of 300 officers of foot guards, says Captain Gronow, only six were thought worthy of being received within the charmed circle at Almack's. The rules as to dress were as strict as the admissions were

select. The Duke of Wellington, at the very height of his renown, was sent away because he appeared in pantaloons instead of in the inevitable silk stockings and breeches. At this time the same uncomfortable dress was *de rigueur*, even with strangers attending the debates of the House of Lords, while in the Commons the members of the Government at all events were expected to appear in that costume. Lord Palmerston owed his admission to Almack's, partly to the most popular of the patronesses, the Countess Cowper, who at that time little thought that the charming young man would become Premier of England, and that she would be his wife. He was a good dancer, and was one of the first to venture upon the waltz which Lady Jersey had introduced from Paris, and which scandalised the virtuous Byron. Among Lord Palmerston's partners was the Countess Lieven, a lady whom the Russian Government had sent over to England to do a little diplomacy, and a good deal of *espionnage*; faculties which she retained to a good old age, and which induced the present Emperor Napoleon to request her withdrawal from Paris during the Crimean war. Lord Palmerston seems to have had the good sense to avoid the gambling at that time fearfully prevalent. White's and Brooks's were nothing better than "hells," at which faro, macao, and other games were played for enormous stakes. Drummond, the banker, lost £20,000 at one sitting to Beau Brummell; General Scott, the father-in-law of the Duke of Portland and of Canning, contrived, by keeping sober to win £200,000; and Lord Robert Spencer and General Fitzpatrick having been ruined, borrowed money to start a "bank," and after a short time were enabled to retire with £100,000 for one share of the profits. To literature Palmerston made small pretensions. He is believed to have had some part in the "New Whig Guide." Peel and Croker also contributed to it, but it possessed none of the polished wit of the "Anti-Jacobin," and was characterised by personality rather than by genuine sarcasm. In his thirty-fourth year Palmerston's career as a man of fashion and a statesman was all but terminated in a very sudden and violent manner. On April 8th, 1818, he rode down as usual to the Horse Guards, and having alighted from his horse, he was in the act of ascending the staircase, when a half-pay lieutenant in the 62nd Regiment, named Davis, discharged a pistol at him. The ball struck the minister above the hip, grazing the skin and producing a contusion of the back. Had he not moved quickly round when passing the turn of the banister,

the shot must have taken a fatal direction. As it was, the wound was merely a painful one, and necessitated but a few days' confinement to the house. Davis, more lucky than Bellingham, who was tried and executed almost instantaneously, was confined in a mad-house, although the murderer of Perceval was at least as mad as the would-be murderer of Palmerston.

It might have been expected that when peace was restored, the Secretary at War would have had an easy time. The reverse was the fact. So long as the country was engaged in a life-and-death conflict with the man who was considered the enemy of the human race, it bore cheerfully the burdens inseparable from a great war. But when the struggle was over, and it was found that a great portion of these burdens still had to be sustained in order to keep up a large standing army, loud were the complaints. The service which had been the pride of the nation now became its aversion. It was considered to be the foe of the people, and the instrument of a tyrannical government in suppressing popular manifestations. These sentiments were not long in finding expression in Parliament. Brougham, like a dashing cavalry officer, made brilliant charges; and Hume, with his heavy artillery of statistics, kept pounding away at Palmerston's position, who generally held it entire. The one speech a year that he used to make when moving the army estimates, had now to be supplemented by repeated explanations and refutations, and involved more frequent attendance in the House, and less frequent appearance at Almack's, than had been his wont during the halcyon days of war. But, doubtless, he found the pleasure of whirling round the ball-room at least equalled by his parliamentary skirmishes. It was pleasant, for instance, to upset Hume's "tottles," and to remind Brougham that the pattern days to which the Whigs were always referring, when there was no standing army, saw a sovereign on the throne who did not scruple to send her faithful Commons to prison, and to advise them not to meddle with matters which they did not understand. Then, by way of enlivening a dull evening rendered heavy by the multiplication table, he would tell the story of how the Guards, marching to put down the rebellion of 1745, were cheered by the people, who shouted, "there go the pillars of the State;" and how one of the Guardsmen wittily replied, "Yes, and when we have done our work you will call us the caterpillars of the State." Occasionally, he assumed a graver tone, as when, on May 16, 1820, he resisted Colonel Davies' motion, censuring the ex-

cessive expenditure of the country. Reminding the House how that expenditure had been incurred, he said, "Engaged in an arduous struggle single-handed, not only against all the powers of Europe, but with the confederated forces of the civilised world, our object was not merely military glory, not the temptation of territorial acquisition, not even what might be considered a more justifiable object—the assertion of violated rights, and the vindication of national honour—but we were contending for our very existence as an independent nation. When the political horizon was thus clouded, when no human foresight could tell from what quarter relief was to be expected, when the utmost effort of national energy was not to despair, I would ask, if at that period it could have been shown that Europe might have been delivered from its thralldom, but that this contingent good must be purchased at the price of a long and patient endurance of burdens, we should not have accepted the conditions with gratitude? I lament as deeply as any one the burdens of the country, but it should be remembered that they are the price we had agreed to pay for our freedom and independence." A few days after this he was seized with sudden illness while moving the army estimates, and was compelled to sit down, but with his usual pluck soon made a fresh effort. On June 14, he defended the "Peterloo" massacre, by declaring that the services of the troops had been rendered necessary by the machinations of traitors against those liberties which Englishmen had derived from their forefathers, and which he trusted they would transmit unimpaired to their children.

There were few subjects unconnected with his department on which Lord Palmerston made set speeches, during the twenty years that elapsed from the time of his taking office to his resignation in 1828. Two of these were connected with religion, and are worth a brief notice. On April 9th, 1824, the Chancellor of the Exchequer moved a vote of not more than £500,000 for the building of additional churches, on the ground of the great spiritual distitution which prevailed, and argued that as Parliament had recently granted money to the Roman Catholics of Ireland and the Presbyterians of Scotland, it could not reasonably object to the present vote. Hume, however, resisted it, and advised the Government to make an inquiry into the income of the Bishop of Durham. As to Ireland, he said, she has received but a paltry £10,000 for Maynooth, while she pays every year two and a half millions in tithes. Mr. Bankes followed, and excited irrepressible shouts of laughter, by urging upon ministers to pro-

mote the union of "sexes," instead of "sects." Then Lord Palmerston rose, and delivered a speech whose sentiments are most curiously out of date in these days of weekly offerings, open seats, and splendid churches built by private munificence. He said he was not one of those who wished to see political distinctions established between religious sects, but at the same time he regretted to see the increasing number of Dissenters. "It was his wish that the Established Church should be the predominant one in the country, for nothing could tend more to the tranquillity and happiness of the people than a community of sentiment, so far as it could be obtained without intolerance to any party. If they denied to the people the right of attending Divine worship, according to the practice of the Established Church, how could they expect that the members of the Establishment would continue to increase? It had been said that the defect ought to be remedied by voluntary contributions, and the case of the Dissenters was alluded to in support of the opinion. But there was a difference between the two cases. The Dissenters, both rich and poor, were under a necessity for providing themselves with places of worship, for which the State made no provision, and it was easy for the rich Dissenters to make up the sum required. But with respect to the Church of England, it was the poor alone who felt the want of church accommodation. The rich could purchase pews, and were always sure of finding sufficient room, but it would be most preposterous to say that the poor should subscribe for churches out of their small earnings." These arguments seemed to prevail, for the motion was carried by 148 votes to 89 against it. But what a picture of religion does it present! The rich man snugly ensconced in the pew which he had *bought*, and the poor man left without accommodation at all, or else "taking the free-seats by storm," as one of the speakers in this debate asserted had happened in the churches already built by Act of Parliament, and which he considered the strongest possible argument for building more. What strange logic too was that which the astute minister used, that because the Dissenter was accustomed to pay for his places of worship, he might be left to do so, and because the Churchman had had his places of worship provided for him, and his religion had cost him nothing, he ought not to be asked to pay anything. Truly since then the Church has passed from death to life.

The second subject was more important than the first. The settlement of it well nigh involved the country in civil war.

It is to Palmerston's credit that on the question of Roman Catholic claims to civil privileges, he took up from the first ground which his colleagues were forced to take unwillingly twenty years later. True, he was a member of a cabinet which resisted emancipation; and it may seem strange to us that such a subject could be considered an open question. But it must be remembered that the King and the Regent had alike insisted that it should not be pressed upon them, and that it was therefore necessarily held in abeyance until the stronger influence of public opinion had overcome royal obstinacy, and extorted the concession which had been so long denied. In this matter Palmerston was far in advance of Peel. Yet even he had not reached the point upon which in these days all of us stand, that no man ought to suffer political disabilities on account of his religious belief. He expressly said that he would "never admit the claims of Roman Catholics to stand upon the ground of right." The question with him was simply one of expediency, not of principle. The debate in which he first had the opportunity of declaring himself upon the Catholic question, took place on February 25th, and March 1st and 2nd, 1813. It was commenced by Grattan, in an eloquent appeal for justice. On the second night, Peel made a long speech in behalf of the Government, opposing the motion. Lord Palmerston, then, be it remembered, under thirty years of age, stood up with no little courage to oppose the policy of his colleagues. Having explained that he looked upon the matter simply as one of expediency, he contended that there was no danger in granting the claims of the Romanists, that, in fact, there was something obviously absurd in the system which allowed men of that faith to enter the army and the navy, and to rise to certain positions in those services, but to deny them the power of rising to the highest positions; in other words, which placed arms in the hands of the less educated, and withheld them from the most highly educated. He then discussed the hypothesis, that Romanists would make use of their position in Parliament to injure the Constitution and the Church, and he contended that they, like all other persons, would be liable to the influence of party, and would therefore not vote together. Moreover, if they did combine, they would be powerless, unless they united with one of the great Protestant parties, and barter their aid in the conflict for the concession of their object, when the victory should be gained. He admitted that parties sometimes made great sacrifices to obtain power; "but," he continued, "whatever be the errors

of individuals, I never can bring myself to believe that there would at any time be found in this House a sufficiently powerful and numerous Protestant party, so profligate in principle, and so dead to a sense of everything which could be due to themselves, as to barter away any part of the religious establishment of the empire for the gratification of political ambition. But supposing, again, this combination of improbabilities to occur, and such a vote to be extorted from this House, I trust there would still be found in the other House of Parliament, in a Protestant Sovereign, and above all in the indignant feeling of a betrayed people, barriers amply sufficient to protect the Protestant establishments of the empire from profanation by such sacrilegious hands." He then went on to show that so long as the disabilities were in force, we could not be said to derive from the Romanists all those advantages which we might otherwise expect, nor to avail ourselves of all the resources of the country. No doubt the conduct of the Romanists in Ireland had been reprehensible, but could it be expected that men of ancient lineage and large possessions, and who had a deep interest in the common weal, and were endowed with capacities for rendering them useful to their country, would consent to be alone excluded from a career in which they might attain to eminence? He added, "What we have lost by the continuance of this system, it is not for man to know. What we may have lost, can be more easily imagined. If it had unfortunately happened, that by circumstances of birth and education, a Wellington, a Nelson, a Burke, a Fox, or a Pitt had belonged to this class of the community, of what honours and what glory might not the page of British history have been deprived! To what perils and calamities might not this country have been exposed! The question is not, whether we would have so large a proportion of the population Catholic or not. There they are, and we must deal with them as we can. It is in vain to think that by any human pressure we can stop the spring which gushes from the earth. But it is for us to consider whether we will force it to spend its strength in secret and hidden courses, undermining our fences, and corrupting our soil; or whether we shall at once turn the current into the open and spacious channel of honourable and constitutional ambition, converting it into the means of national prosperity and public wealth." This promising speech was followed on the succeeding night by a most eloquent appeal from the young minister's political master, George Canning. He made some splendid points. Referring to the fact that a large number of

Romanists were in the army, he said, "The Catholics, it seems, hold no faith with heretics. They disregard the sanctity of the most solemn obligation, or use it only as a snare for entrapping Protestants into a reliance which they may afterwards betray. What will you have the Catholics do to prove their sincerity? They die in your defence. Aye! that is their hypocrisy." Then alluding to an incident which had occurred that evening, he said the Lord Mayor of Dublin had come to the bar of the House for the first time since the Union. "What great and glorious victory did he come to announce? He came with a petition from the Corporation to exclude their Catholic brethren from the franchises of the constitution. But is this his only purpose, or does he approach us with only one hand full? No, Sir; while in his right hand he waves the prohibitory scroll which is to exorcise Roman Catholics from the pale of the State; with the other, he tenders a petition against the monopoly of the East Indian Company. Down with monopoly in trade; but live the monopoly of power." The third night of the debate was very animated and prolonged. The House divided amidst the greatest excitement at four o'clock of the morning of March 3rd; and loud were the cheers which announced the result—for Grattan's motion, 264; against, 224.

In spite of this triumph, sixteen years were to elapse before the much-debated question received a practical solution. The memorandum of the late Sir Robert Peel, published by his literary executors, Earl Stanhope and Mr. Cardwell, shows to what extremities that statesman and the Duke of Wellington allowed the country to be brought, before they would give way. A civil war was certain if they did not yield, and they yielded to that just as, seventeen years later, Peel yielded Protection only when the nation was threatened with famine. In both cases, physical reasons extorted that concession which moral reasons could not induce. It should be remembered of Palmerston that, while his name will not be associated, as Peel's is, with religious or commercial emancipation, he was an early and a willing advocate, Peel a tardy and most unwilling convert. Nevertheless, with great generosity, Palmerston defended Peel's conduct with regard to the Catholic question in 1829, although at that time the high-handed conduct of the Duke of Wellington had driven the Canningites from office, and Lord Palmerston among them. In the final debate, before the passing of the bill, the ex-Secretary-at-War made a speech which manifested a great advance in power and eloquence. Its author attached more

importance to it than he had attributed to any former speech, and we find it given verbatim in "Hansard," "by permission." He pointed out, that while England, with a population of fourteen millions, according to the census of 1821, contributed fifty millions to the public revenue, Ireland, with a population of seven millions, contributed barely five millions of money, and he attributed the difference to general misgovernment of Ireland, and especially to the disabilities under which the great majority of the inhabitants lay. He added, "Beyond the limits of the United Kingdom, there is no adventure so difficult and hopeless, no task so hazardous and desperate, as to daunt the enterprise of our capitalists, or to arrest the current of our wealth; but around Ireland, the wand of the enchanter has drawn the forbidding circle. I call upon the House to break the spell, and to let in upon Ireland the wholesome and fertilising stream." Then followed an eloquent invective against those who were willing to run the risk of bloodshed, rather than yield the demands of Ireland. Altogether, this speech may fairly be considered as one of Lord Palmerston's ablest. It entitled him to a place among the orators of the day.

There were few other topics upon which Lord Palmerston spoke during his tenure of the War Office. On one occasion, he had to present a petition from his constituents against slavery, and in doing so, said that he thought slavery should be abolished by degrees, and that he regretted the obstacles to emancipation which had been raised by the colonial legislators; for while at that time there was every desire to treat the slave-owners tenderly, they would, by persistent opposition, raise against themselves such a storm as no prudent man would care to encounter. On another occasion, he was fifty years in advance of the age, and strongly recommended the embankment of the Thames. He referred to the handsome quays of Paris and Dublin, and described the foreigner visiting all the sights of London, and asking at last where the Thames was. Then he drew a picture of the dire confusion which prevailed in the London streets, by reason of the excess of traffic. He said, "I have heard of the confusion which followed the battle of Leipsic, where men, horses, and carriages were mingled together, but I cannot conceive it possible that that scene can have equalled the confusion daily to be witnessed in the City." He concluded by hoping that the bill would pass; and while it could not be said of its mover, Colonel Trench, as was said of the Roman Emperor, that he found brick, and left marble, yet it might be said, that

he found the banks of the Thames covered with mud, he left them protected and embellished with granite. Another matter on which he had to speak, was no subject for jest. He had become a Director of the Cornwall and Devon Mining Company, a speculation which, by the disgraceful misconduct of its promoters, led to the ruin of most of its shareholders. Several members of Parliament were connected with it. Among them was the notorious Wilkes, who was accused by Alderman Waithman of having pocketed, for his own benefit, a large sum of money, and of having been a party to the division of £45,000 among the directors, who, while neglecting to pay the calls upon their own shares, had been ruining the unhappy shareholders, by repeated demands. Wilkes made a long but not very satisfactory defence, and in the discussion which followed, some very unparliamentary language was used. Lord Palmerston contented himself with a simple denial of all knowledge of the transactions alleged; and his character was so high, that this denial was considered a sufficient answer to the charge. On the Test and Corporation Repeal Act, he took up a somewhat strange position. He opposed the second reading of Lord John Russell's measure, on February 26th, 1828, on the ground that the grievance which it proposed to remedy, was merely theoretical, and that it would be unwise to remove that, while the substantial injustice under which the Roman Catholics suffered was allowed to continue. He could scarcely, however, have felt otherwise than satisfied at the result of the division, even though he did not join in the deafening cheers which announced that 237 had voted for the bill, and only 193 against it. The proposal to provide for Canning's family, after the death of that statesman, drew from him a warm eulogium of the policy of his late leader, and he declared that the Government would deserve the confidence of the country only so far as it followed that policy—a sentiment which, as we shall presently see, had a most important influence upon his career.

Lord Palmerston's practical acquaintance with the duties of his department, and the skill with which he defended a high military expenditure in time of peace against the attacks of Mr. Hume and the economists, led to his retention of office under many changes of ministry. When the quarrel between Castlereagh and Canning broke up the Portland administration, Palmerston did not feel himself precluded from serving under Perceval; and when, after the assassination of Perceval, Canning failed to obtain the premiership or the leadership of the House of Commons, Palmerston did not hesitate to form

a part of Lord Liverpool's administration. That long-lived government afforded him the opportunity of acquainting himself with the duties of his department, both in time of war and of peace. When at length, after the death of Lord Liverpool, Canning obtained the long-deferred object of his ambition, it was but natural that his followers should be associated with him. Lord Goderich succeeded to Canning's place and Canning's policy, and so Palmerston continued at the War Office; but when the ministry fell, and the bitter opponents of the lately deceased statesman came into office, it might have been expected that his followers would have betaken themselves to the Opposition benches. It has been stated that Canning's widow deeply felt and bitterly resented the readiness with which her husband's friends consented to ally themselves with his foes, and, as she might almost have deemed them, his murderers. Foremost among those who thus disappointed her, were Mr. Huskisson and Lord Palmerston. The latter was induced to join the Wellington administration by the former; and when the one resigned, so did the other. The immediate cause of this secession was a very unimportant difference between the seceders and their colleagues, quite trivial, in fact, when we remember what weighty matters were allowed to be open questions. The borough of East Retford had disgraced itself by malpractices, and a bill was brought in by the Government to transfer the franchise from the borough to the hundred. The Reformers opposed this proposition, and urged that the vacant seats should be given to Birmingham. On a division, Huskisson voted against the Government. Immediately after the division, at two o'clock in the morning, he wrote a letter to the Duke of Wellington, offering to resign, in order "to prevent the injury to the King's service which may ensue from the appearance of division in His Majesty's councils." The Duke, who loved not the Canningites, caught at this letter, treated it as a positive resignation, communicated it to the King, and appointed a successor. In vain Huskisson contended that he had never meant to resign, but intended only to give his chief an opportunity of obtaining a substitute if it seemed wise to do so. The Duke persisted in declaring that the resignation was Huskisson's own doing, refused to allow him to withdraw or to explain, and for a long time prevented him from having an interview with George IV. The consequence was that the discarded minister made a long statement in the House of Commons, to which Peel made a lame reply, and Palmerston said that inasmuch as he had joined the existing administra-

tion only because the accession of Mr. Huskisson had been a guarantee that the principles which they held in common would be carried out, he could not remain in the Government now that Mr. Huskisson was no longer a member of it.

There is little doubt that the consciousness of an essential difference of policy between the Canningites and himself led the Duke to get rid of them on so shabby a pretence. There was such a difference, and Lord Palmerston was not long in pointing it out. After twenty years of office he found himself for the first time free to criticise the doings of ministers. He soon discovered what department of politics was most adapted to his tastes, and he entered upon it with an ardour that speedily raised him from the position of a subordinate to that of the foremost statesman of the day. The quarrel with the Duke was the turning point of his career. From that time he separated himself from the old Tory party, and he associated himself with the Reformers. His accession influenced the history not only of the Whig party, but of Europe. Had it not been for that event, the Whigs would long ago have identified themselves with the doctrine of non-intervention, which was an original part of their programme. As it is, they have for more than thirty years become the promoters of "a spirited foreign policy."

Lord Palmerston commenced his new career as a foreign politician on June 1st, 1829, by criticising the conduct of the Government with respect to Portugal. A few words must suffice to explain an intricate and rather tedious story. By a treaty, signed August 25, 1825, under the auspices of the English Ambassador at Lisbon, Sir Charles Stewart, the King of Portugal, John VI., agreed to recognise as a separate state Brazil, which had hitherto been a Portuguese dependency; and he named his eldest son Pedro, "Emperor of the Brazils." In the following March, King John died, and instead of leaving his younger son, Miguel, heir, appointed one of his daughters regent, until "the lawful heir" should give orders with respect to the crown. A swift ship was despatched to Rio Janeiro announcing to Pedro the news of his father's death; and he at once issued decrees by which he assumed that he himself was the lawful heir, but that as it was advisable that the government of Portugal should be kept independent of that of Brazil, he devolved his succession to the throne of the former country upon his daughter, Maria Gloria. He further decreed that this princess, a girl of ten years old, should espouse her uncle Miguel, and that a constitution

should be granted to Portugal. To ensure the fulfilment of these arrangements, he stated that he should take possession of the crown until they were carried out. These decrees gave great satisfaction to the Liberals in Portugal; but there speedily arose a reactionary party, who insisted that Pedro had, by the acceptance of the crown of Brazil previously to his father's death, renounced all right to the crown of Portugal, which therefore devolved upon his brother Miguel, as the next heir male. Then followed a long struggle between the two parties, which lasted until 1834, and was terminated by the Quadruple Treaty of April 22, 1834, by which England, France, Spain, and Portugal, agreed to recognise Isabella as Queen of Spain, Maria as Queen of Portugal, and to drive out Carlo from the first country, and Miguel from the second. It will be seen that these events, thus briefly narrated, occupied a period of no less than eight years. They caused great excitement, not only in the country most concerned, but in England and France; the more so, as some time before England declared openly in favour of Pedro and Maria, many English officers joined the ranks of those sovereigns, against the orders, but no doubt with the connivance, of the British ministers. This, however, was after the formation of the Grey administration, of which we shall speak presently. While the Duke of Wellington was in office, it was the policy of the foreign minister, the Earl of Aberdeen, to favour Miguel. It was this policy which Lord Palmerston repeatedly attacked during the brief period that he was out of office, from May, 1828, to November, 1830, and which, on his being entrusted with the Foreign Seals at the latter date, he took care to reverse. In the speech mentioned above, delivered June 1st, 1829, he denounced Miguel in the strongest language. He accused him of every crime, even of the intention to murder his own niece. He went on to say, "There are two great parties in Europe—one would endeavour to bear sway by the force of public opinion, the other would endeavour to bear sway by the force of physical control, and the almost unanimous judgment of Europe assigns the latter as the present connexion of England." After an elaborate simile he continued, "Those statesmen who know how to avail themselves of the passions, and the interests, and the opinions of mankind, will be able to gain an ascendancy, and exercise a sway over human affairs, far out of all proportion greater than belong to the power and the resources of the State over which they preside; while those, on the other hand, who seek to check improvement, to cherish abuses, to crush opinions, and

to prohibit the human race from thinking, whatever may be the apparent power which they may wield, will find their weapon snap short in the hand when most they need its protection. In the first of these positions stood England two years ago, when our political influence among the nations of the earth was infinitely greater—not than our means of defending our independence, or asserting our honour—but infinitely greater than any power we possess of coercing the conduct of others. In the second of these conditions Austria is now, who, by the narrowness of her views, and the infatuated prejudices of her policy, has almost reduced herself in point of influence to a second-rate power. . . Such England was ; such Austria is ; that England is now. . . It is impossible for any man of late to have set foot beyond the shores of these islands, without observing with deep mortification a great and sudden change in the manner in which England is spoken of abroad ; without finding that, instead of being looked up to as the pattern, no less than as the model of constitutional freedom, as the refuge from persecution, and the shield against oppression, her name is coupled by every tongue on the Continent with everything that is hostile to improvement, and friendly to despotism, from the banks of the Tagus to the shores of the Bosphorus, and that she is represented as the key-stone of that arch of which Miguel and Spain and Austria and Mahmoud are the component parts.” He concluded by saying that formerly England was supposed to desire that all nations might possess the blessing of constitutional government and freedom, but that now she was believed to wish to keep those blessings to herself, in order to give her greater superiority over the other nations.

Palmerston renewed his attacks in the following year ; and in a speech made on March 10th, 1830, he took occasion to answer those members who had said that their only business was to attend to domestic affairs, and that they might leave ministers to look after foreign affairs. “As well,” said he, “might a man think, that, provided he looked carefully after his estate, and managed his household with economy and order, it was indifferent to him what might be his conduct towards his neighbours. A fair character, a good name, the esteem and respect of others, are not less valuable to a nation than they are to an individual. Reputation gives power and security from molestation, to the one as well as to the other.” He then made jest of those persons who hoped to make foreign affairs unintelligible to the multitude, by the use of diplomatic jargon, and subsequently entered at length into the whole

history of the Miguel and Pedro quarrel, his speech occupying twenty-seven columns in Hansard's Debates.

It was not long before the censor of the ministerial foreign policy had an opportunity of giving a practical development to his own ideas. The internal condition of England at this time was very critical. Fortunately for the nation, the Duke of York had died before his elder brother, and the revolution that would have inevitably broken out, had a prince ascended the throne pledged as he was to resist, even at the risk of bloodshed, the concession of the Catholic claims, was thereby avoided. George IV. had in the last year of his reign, and after his brother's death, yielded; but only when the Duke of Wellington told him that either Ireland must be re-conquered, which in the then condition of the army was impossible, or that he must abdicate, or that he must assent to the Emancipation Bill. Further concession the Iron Duke was determined not to grant, although a revolution in England seemed as likely to follow the denial of Reform, as a revolution in Ireland would have followed the longer maintenance of Roman Catholic disabilities. In the midst of the daily growing excitement George IV. died. His successor was believed to be of more liberal ideas, and his accession was a matter of rejoicing. In the general election that followed, the Reformers gained about fifty seats; and shortly after the assembling of the new Parliament they succeeded, alike, however, to their own surprise and that of their opponents, in beating the Government, by a majority of twenty-nine, on Sir Henry Parnell's motion for the appointment of a select committee to enquire into the civil list. On the next day, November 16th, 1830, the Duke of Wellington in the Upper, and Sir Robert Peel in the Lower, House, announced that the ministers had resigned. Earl Grey was at once sent for by the King, and formed a new administration within a week. On Monday, November 22nd, the House of Lords was crowded with strangers, eager to see the new Chancellor take his seat. By some mishap the patent of peerage had not reached the Clerk of the House, and thus Brougham was unable to take the oaths. Having, however, been appointed Lord Chancellor, he was *ex-officio* Speaker of the Upper House, and as such, entitled to take his seat on the woolsack, but without power to take part in the debates. Thus the curious spectacle was presented of a commoner sitting in, and presiding over, the deliberations of the House of Lords, and at the same time forbidden to share in those deliberations, and even to put the question. The same night Earl Grey announced his intention

of bringing in a Reform Bill. This announcement directed the attention of the people from the remarkably aristocratic character of the cabinet, a by no means commendable feature at that time. Out of the fifteen members, only one was an untitled commoner, and thirteen were peers or sons of peers. Among them was Lord Palmerston, who, on the strength of his recent strictures upon the foreign policy of the late Government, was appointed Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

The promised Reform Bill was brought into the House of Commons by Lord John Russell, on March 1st, a day now rendered memorable by the introduction of more than one measure of the kind. No fewer than 607 members, beside the Speaker, divided on the second reading, with the result of a majority of one in favour of the bill. There was one provision of it exceedingly distasteful to members, that which proposed to reduce their numbers from 658 to 596. When, therefore, the motion was put for going into committee, General Gascoyne, M.P. for Liverpool, moved that it be an instruction to the committee that the total number of members should not be diminished. This was carried against the Government by a majority of eight votes. Earl Grey asked the King to dissolve. He at first refused to do so, on the ground that the Parliament (elected but a few months before) had been very liberal to him. His scruples were, however, overcome by Lord Brougham, and while the Lords were in hot debate upon the conduct of the ministers, King William suddenly entered, and announced in a shrill voice to his astonished audience, that he came to prorogue Parliament, with a view to its immediate dissolution. He then retired, and the two Houses adjourned amid almost unparalleled excitement. The elections that followed were, in some instances, disgraced by acts of great brutality and violence. They resulted in a considerable gain to the Reformer, so that, when the Reform Bill was again proposed for a second reading, the majority was increased from one to 136. At the election, Lord Palmerston lost his seat for Cambridge. He had been re-elected without intermission on every occasion since 1811, and on only one occasion, in 1826, had he to stand a contest. But in 1831 he was opposed by Mr. Goulburn, an old antagonist, defeated five years before, and by Mr. William Yates Peel, brother of Sir Robert Peel, and a member of the Duke of Wellington's late administration. There was a fourth candidate, Mr. William Cavendish, a Whig, and the polling gave Mr. Goulburn 805 votes, Mr. Peel 804, Mr. Cavendish 630, and Lord Palmerston 610. The two last coalesced and received 596 split votes.

Defeated at the University, Lord Palmerston fell back upon his first seat, Bletchingley. The King, in opening the new Parliament, dwelt upon the urgency of Reform, and the bill passed its final division in the Commons on September 21st, by a majority of 109. There was great rejoicing; but there was also great apprehension, for it was believed that the Lords would offer strenuous opposition to the measure. The second reading was moved on October 3rd, and the debate that followed lasted five nights. Eloquence and warnings were alike in vain. In vain did the Lord Chancellor supplicate his colleagues "on bended knees" not to reject the measure. The Peers divided at half-past six in the morning, after speaking all night, and the bill was lost by 199 votes to 158, the Dukes of Cumberland and Gloucester being in the majority. Earl Grey thereupon presented two alternatives to the King: resignation or authority to create a sufficient number of peers to carry the bill. William refused to accept the latter, and so the ministry retired from office. Lord Lyndhurst was invited to form an administration. He sent for the Duke of Wellington. The Duke seeing the state of the country, came to the conclusion that some measure of Reform was necessary, and proposed to Sir Robert Peel to form an administration on the principle of concession to the fear of revolution. Peel declared that he would never again yield as he had yielded on the Catholic Emancipation question; so the attempt to form a Tory ministry failed; and just as the chaise and four was on the point of starting from the Reform Club to Birmingham, to tell the Political Union to lead a hundred thousand men upon London, the bells struck up, and announced that the King had sent for Earl Grey. The Whig leader obtained his own terms; but William wrote to the Conservative peers, requesting them to stay away from the division, and so the bill passed the third reading by a majority of twenty-two, and on June 7th, 1832, became law. Another general election, the third in less than two years, followed. The extreme Radicals carried all before them. Moderate Liberals found themselves supplanted by men of more advanced opinions, and the new borough of Brighton returned two ultra-Reformers under the very eye of the King. The first sight that the Reformed Parliament presented was that of Cobbett, seated upon the Treasury benches, and refusing to yield them to ministers on the ground that he had as good right to be there as they. The debates soon showed that men possessing no one qualification for the legislature had been sent there for no other reason than the circumstance of extreme opinions, and for the first time

Parliament included among its members a professional prize-fighter. Motions for the repeal of the Septennial Act, for introducing the Ballot, for ousting the Bishops from the Upper House, and for other measures of this character, followed each other in rapid succession, and Earl Grey and his colleagues found themselves compelled to make use of the aid of Sir Robert Peel and his supporters, in order to counteract the designs of the Reformers. It was not surprising that the upper classes were alarmed; that the Duke prophesied the abolition of Royalty, and that a courtly old Tory, like Thomas Raikes, should record in his diary the ominous fact, that there was room at the Exchange for the statue of only one more sovereign, and that in all probability no more room would be required.

During all this time of excitement, Lord Palmerston kept almost entirely to his own department. He made but one speech in favour of Reform, on March 3rd, 1831, two nights after the introduction of the first bill. He said that England was a country averse to change, and that good measures often had to be reluctantly extorted. In the present case, innovation was demanded, not merely by bow-window orators and market-place politicians, but by those whose property, intelligence, and station placed them in a far different class. The error of the late administration, he continued, had been a belief that the firm and steady determination of a few men in power, could bear down the opinions of the many, and stifle the feelings of mankind. That error had set Europe in flames. In England, Reform had been too long delayed. If three years ago advantage had been taken of the conviction of corrupt boroughs, to bring gradually into connexion with the House the great unrepresented towns; if, instead of drawing nice equations between the manufacturing and agricultural interests, and with true algebraical accuracy bringing out a result of improvement just equal to nothing; if, instead of this, the Government had turned Reformers on ever so moderate a scale, the House would not be discussing the sweeping bill then before it. He then proceeded to defend himself from the charge of inconsistency in supporting the bill, and said, that even if he had changed, there was good precedent for it in the conduct of the Opposition with regard to Catholic Emancipation. He declared his belief that Canning would have taken the same course, and said, "If ever there was a man who took great and enlarged views of human affairs, that man was Mr. Canning; if ever there was a man who, as it were, polarised his opinions by universal and all-pervading

principles of action, that man was undoubtedly Mr. Canning; and when the assailants of the Government on this question would endeavour to pin down his gigantic mind by the Lilliputian threads of verbal quotation, he (Lord Palmerston) repudiated in Mr. Canning's name the conclusions that they would draw; and he felt convinced, that if Mr. Canning had been standing there then, his mighty genius would have embraced within its comprehensive grasp all the various necessities upon which the conclusions of ministers had been founded, and would, in all probability, have stated to the House, with powers, alas! how different from those of any then within those walls, the same opinions." He concluded by saying that the key to Canning's opinions was to be found in his speech of February 24th, 1826, when he said, "They who resist improvement because it is innovation may find themselves compelled to accept innovation when it has ceased to be improvement."

Almost the only other domestic subject upon which Lord Palmerston spoke during Earl Grey's administration, was Free Trade. This topic was brought up in connexion with a petition from the silk weavers of London, complaining of distress, and asking for special legislation in their behalf. Lord Palmerston said, that "what were called protecting duties, were, in fact, disturbing duties. They impeded the employment of capital, checked industry, and stopped the progress of wealth. It was for the interest of the country to cast off the fetters which bound it. It was monstrous to suppose that commerce could be all on one side, and that nations could sell without buying. By repealing what were called protective duties, and acting on liberal principles, we should compel other nations to follow our example." He was not, however, at that time prepared to carry out these sound principles to their legitimate issue, and in a short speech, made about two years after this, he said that he could not consent to abolish the Corn Laws, and that the utmost he could do was to enquire into their operation. In a few remarks, made between these two occasions, he expressed his belief that the Corn Laws were not so beneficial to agriculture as they were generally supposed to be, and that there was nothing politically unsound in relying upon foreign countries for a supply of food.

But if Lord Palmerston had nothing to say upon the questions of Home Policy, the Bank Charter, the East India Company, Tithes, the Abolition of Slavery, and was silent even upon the Irish Church Temporalities, which led to the secession of the present Earl of Derby, the Duke of Richmond,

the Earl of Ripon, and Sir James Graham, he had quite enough topics of his own demanding his attention. It is scarcely possible that he could, any more than the ministers who resigned in June, 1834, have approved the proposal to secularise the revenues of the Irish Church, for he was always a great upholder of ecclesiastical privileges. Nevertheless, he did not resign with his four dissentient colleagues. He was not much given to resigning, and it is probable he thought that as the question had been an open one with the cabinet hitherto, there was no reason why it should not remain open, nor why he should not continue to conduct the foreign policy of the country, a department to which he had given his whole heart. A further reason for retaining his seat in the cabinet, lay in the critical condition of the Continent. In addition to the civil wars in Spain and Portugal, already referred to, there was a revolution in the Netherlands, an insurrection in Poland, a new kingdom to be established in Greece, and Turkey to be rescued from the clutches of the Russian eagle. There were troubles also in Germany and in Italy. In fact, there was from the Mediterranean to the Baltic, from the Tagus to the Bosphorus, nothing but war, and rumours of war, great distress of nations, and men's hearts failing them for fear of the things that were coming upon the earth. Upon all those things, the English Foreign Secretary was expected to have something to say, and in not a few of them something to do. Thus, however true it might be, as Mr. Grant has written in his "Random Recollections of the House of Commons," that Lord Palmerston was "very irregular in his attendance in his parliamentary duties," he could scarcely have been "indolent." The man who brought about the Anglo-French union, who helped to tear up the Treaty of Vienna, to shatter the Holy Alliance by the establishment of the Quadruple Alliance, and to fill four of the thrones of Europe, may have seemed, but could not really have been idle.

Paris is the political centre of Europe. It is the source from which the current of most European events flow, and which, having more or less inundated the Continent, at last meets in Vienna, and, under the form of a treaty, the dam which is to prevent its further progress. These dams are not very durable. A few years' pressure against them is nearly certain to break them down. A new rising of the waters at the French capital is sure to destroy the work of the political engineers at the Austrian capital. So it proved in 1830. The Treaty of Vienna was not more than fifteen years old when the Revolution of the Three Days prepared the

way for that complete destruction of it which has taken place in more recent times. The Netherlands were the first country to feel the effects of the outbreak at Paris, which led to the downfall of Charles X. A provisional government was declared at Brussels in August, and in December the independence of Belgium was recognised by England and France. It was a difficult game which Palmerston then had to play. He was resolved that Belgium should not be incorporated with, nor become a family dependency of, France. At the same time, being a member of a ministry pledged to retrenchment and peace, he could not venture to follow the example of France in sending 50,000 men to aid the Belgians, and perhaps to help themselves. Fortunately Louis Philippe was too newly seated on the throne to feel very secure there, and Palmerston took advantage of this circumstance to persuade the citizen King that he must refuse permission to his son, the Duc de Nemours, to accept the crown which was offered to that prince. The matter ended amicably, by the selection of Leopold of Saxe Coburg, who had been the son-in-law of a king of England, who was about to become the son-in-law of the King of France, and who, while these sheets are passing through the press, has followed to the grave that English minister to whom he in great measure owed his throne. The tide of revolution spread to Poland, and here Palmerston was not so fortunate in guiding it according to his own will. Austria and Prussia were as desirous as Russia itself was to put down the insurrection. The armies of the three great Powers stood upon the frontiers of that unhappy country, and at the first intimation that we intended to enforce the Treaty of Vienna, those armies would have marched, killed, and taken possession before a single English regiment could have embarked, or a single English ship sailed. So when the Radicals, forgetting all their denunciations of extravagant expenditure, urged the Government to interpose in behalf of the Poles, Palmerston replied that the question was not, what England had the right to do, but what she had the power to do. The treaty gave her the right of interference, no doubt; but if she exercised it, she would only bring upon the Poles greater calamities. Moreover, as most of the other great Powers refused to enforce the conditions of the treaty, it was not incumbent upon England to undertake that office alone; nor, supposing that France were willing to join, would it be prudent to engage in a quarrel which would involve the whole of Europe. The Russians were therefore allowed to wreak their vengeance upon the Poles, and pro-

fited by the impunity thus secured to repeat their conduct thirty years later. Nor could Lord Palmerston be persuaded to interfere between the German sovereigns and the German people. He declared that their dispute was a domestic matter; and on being asked to explain what was the principle which guided his foreign policy, he said that the Government took office to promote peace, retrenchment, and reform. There was nothing about our interference (he would not recognise the "un-English word intervention") in the affairs of other nations. The principle upon which Government ought to go was, that of non-interference by force of arms in the affairs of any other country; but England should not be precluded, when it was expedient to do so, from interfering by friendly counsel and advice. There were two noticeable men in Parliament at this time, who, if we are to judge from their speeches, would have urged the Government into a war in another part of Europe. In 1827, England, France, and Russia, had united against Turkey, and destroyed the Turkish fleet at Navarino. It was not a victory for the conquerors to pride themselves upon; and one of them soon had reason to change his policy, siding with the vanquished against the victors. The war that broke out between the Czar and the Sultan in 1828, had been followed by the Treaty of Adrianople, but Nicholas had no intention to observe it longer than was necessary; and in the meanwhile, he was prepared to take advantage of every event that offered to increase his influence in Turkey. One soon offered. Mahmoud II. was so hard pressed by his rebellious Pasha, Mehemet Ali, that having asked in vain for the aid of England, he called in the assistance of his old foe, and a Russian army entered Constantinople, and a Russian fleet the Dardanelles. Hume and Henry Bulwer believed that the old and often recorded story would be repeated once more, and that the allies would turn masters. Palmerston, however, declared his disbelief in any such intention, and succeeded in obtaining a promise from the Russian Government to withdraw its troops so soon as the occasion for which they had been summoned ceased to necessitate their presence. This promise was not fulfilled until Turkey had been induced to sign the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, by which the Black Sea was converted into a Russian lake. Closely connected with the Turko-Russian question, was that of Greece; and this was settled, after a fashion, by the selection of Otho of Bavaria. The English minister defended this choice, on the ground that the Bavarians were fond of liberty, and had taken great interest in the struggle of

the Greeks to obtain their independence. How Otho the king fulfilled the expectations of Otho the prince, we all know.

As times went on, the position of the Whigs did not improve. The secession of Mr. Stanley and his colleagues shook the administration, and the constant collisions with the Irish members did not tend to establish it. On the first night of the Session of 1834, there was a fierce quarrel between Lord Althorpe, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Sheil. Palmerston interposed, but was told sarcastically that it was not a case for diplomacy. At length the Speaker ordered the disputants into custody until they promised that they would not fight a duel. Irish questions were destined to be the bane of Earl Grey's cabinet. Scarcely had the ministry been reconstituted after the secession which followed the Irish Church Temporalities Bill, than the attempt to re-enact the Irish Coercion Bill led to the resignation of Lord Althorpe and Mr. Lyttleton. Earl Grey felt that he could not continue to carry on the Government without his Chancellor of the Exchequer, and so he sent in his resignation, and on July 9th—in a voice so tremulous from emotion that he was twice compelled to sit down—he announced that he was no longer Premier. The Whigs, however, did not go out, but re-formed themselves under Lord Melbourne, who, having consented to omit from the bill the clause against political meetings, received the co-operation of Lord Althorpe. The respite was but for four months. Divisions continued to increase among the Whig leaders. They could no longer count upon the support of the Irish members, for O'Connell had denounced them as traitors to Ireland. So, when the death of Earl Spencer removed his son, Lord Althorpe, to the Upper House, Lord Melbourne felt that he could not carry on the Government, and tendered his resignation, and that of his colleagues, which the King, nothing loth, accepted. Thus, Lord Palmerston once more found himself out of office, with all the world before him where to choose his point of attack against his successors. The Duke of Wellington counselled King William to send for Sir Robert Peel, who was then in Italy; and until that statesman could return, the Duke carried on the Government, uniting in himself several of the highest offices. The new Premier thought that he could not hope to command a majority in a Parliament elected in the first fervour of reform, and he obtained leave to dissolve in December, 1834. The result showed the wisdom of this step, for the 500 members returned for England gave a slight majority to the Government. Among the members of the

old ministry who lost their seats was Lord Palmerston. He had been returned at the head of the poll for South Hampshire, in 1832, with Sir G. T. Staunton, another Whig, as his colleague. But, in January, 1835, two Conservatives, Mr. Fleming and Mr. Compton, came in first and second, Lord Palmerston was an indifferent third, and Sir G. Staunton was last. A seat was obtained for the ex-minister at Tiverton, and that little Devonshire constituency he continued to represent for thirty years, not always without a contest. His visits to his constituents were, however, always a "holiday time for him." He enjoyed the amenities of the election, and especially the fulminations of the Chartist butcher, Rowcliffe, without whom the little town on the Exe would not have been itself. The ministerial majority obtained at the English elections was more than counterbalanced by the large predominance of Liberal M.P.'s returned by Scotland and Ireland. This was apparent so soon as the new Parliament met. In the fullest House on record, Mr. Abercromby, the Liberal candidate for the Speakership, obtained 316 votes to Mr. Sutton's 306; so that the Session opened with a ministerial defeat. This was speedily followed by others, and at last, in April, Lord John Russell having moved that the House should resolve itself into a committee for arranging the application of the surplus revenue of the Irish Church to educational purposes, and having twice beaten the Government upon the motion, Sir Robert Peel announced his resignation, and a new Whig ministry, or rather a revival of the old with Lord Melbourne at its head, was formed.

Lord Palmerston was now once more at the Foreign Office; and he was not long in finding ample employment. The "Eastern Question" began soon afterwards to assume an unpleasant appearance, and the Foreign Secretary, not feeling himself bound by the principles of peace and retrenchment which Earl Grey had announced in taking office, considered himself at liberty to interpose. Mehemet Ali became troublesome again, and Turkey did not, on this occasion, as she had in 1839, apply in vain for the assistance of England. The secret treaty of Unkiar Skelessi had so thoroughly alarmed our foreign politicians, that they were resolved not to let the Czar again have an excuse for encumbering the Sultan with help. But a difficulty arose at the outset which threatened more serious consequences even than the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. While England supported Mahmoud, France favoured Mehemet Ali, and this difference of policy soon led to a very grave quarrel. The four Powers, finding

France impracticable, signed a treaty without her, by which they undertook to place the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles in a state of defence, should the Pasha of Egypt direct his forces against Constantinople, and also to interrupt the communications between Egypt and Syria, if the Pasha refused to accept the terms offered by England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia. No sooner was this compact made known, than an outburst of indignation occurred in France. The Paris papers were for instant war against England. The fleets of France and England lay side by side in Besika Bay, not as fourteen years later in friendly alliance, but with guns loaded, ready to fire upon each other as soon as the confidently expected order for the commencement of hostilities should arrive. The excitement increased when the English squadron suddenly took its departure, and sailing to Alexandria, demanded the restoration of the Turkish fleet, which had been treacherously surrendered to the Egyptians by its commander, and, having obtained a refusal, bombarded the city. For this promptitude the French Government was wholly unprepared, and Louis Philippe found it expedient to change his policy and his ministers. Guizot succeeded Thiers, and the new Premier gave the Pasha to understand that France would not support him in his demand for the retention of Syria, and the French squadron was recalled from Besika Bay. In the meanwhile, another still more decisive blow had been struck. Our fleet, under Admiral Stopford and Commodore Napier, attacked and captured the famous stronghold of St. Jean d'Acre, which Napoleon had found impregnable. This success was quickly followed by others, which laid the whole of Syria at the feet of England, and induced the inhabitants to rise in behalf of their legitimate sovereign. The result of all this vigour was that Mehemet Ali was compelled to accept the terms which we had originally offered. These, while conferring upon his family the hereditary succession to the Pashalic of Egypt, compelled him to abandon all designs upon Syria. By the same treaty it was agreed with Turkey, that the Straits of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles should be closed equally against all nations; and thus that portion of the mischief of the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, by which an exception was made in favour of Russia, was rectified, and Turkey was placed under the protection of the five great Powers. Thus, Lord Palmerston won a double victory, checking at the same time French intrigues in Egypt, and reversing Russian diplomacy in European Turkey. He obtained an additional success in Persia and Afghanistan, when Russia was completely out-

manœuvred, and the fame of England and Palmerston was established at the expense of that of Russia and Nicholas. These diplomatic victories were the best answer to the charge brought by Mr. Urquhart and the Russo-phobists, that the English minister was in the pay of Russia. Nevertheless, the accusers were not believed; and the *Times* having opened its columns to Mr. Urquhart, the attacks were continued.

The Melbourne ministry had now become as unpopular as that of Earl Grey. In 1839 it had a majority of only five in the Lower House, upon the third reading of a bill for suspending the constitution of Jamaica for five years, and Lord Melbourne resigned. Sir Robert Peel undertook to form an administration; but finding that the young Queen refused to part with the ladies of the court, all of whom belonged to the great Whig families, he abandoned the attempt, and Lord Melbourne and his colleagues returned to office. But it was only to submit to fresh humiliations and defeats, and to sustain at the hands of Lord Lyndhurst scathing denunciations of their incompetence. The cabinet was not at unity among its members. Several of the ministers shrank from the responsibility of the bold measures in the East which Palmerston advocated, and it was chiefly through the support afforded them by Lord John Russell that the Foreign Minister was enabled to carry them out, and thereby retrieve for a time the reputation of the Government. Another important matter upon which ministers differed was Free Trade. Lord Melbourne declared that the idea of repealing the Corn Laws was absolute insanity; nevertheless, shortly afterwards Lord John Russell gave notice of a motion for taking these enactments into consideration, and Lord Palmerston was fully prepared to co-operate with his colleague.

The Budget of 1841 was made the occasion of a great party fight, which lasted eight nights, and which terminated in the defeat of the ministers, by a majority of thirty-six votes. In the course of this debate Lord Palmerston showed that he had become completely converted to Free Trade. In reply to a sarcastic speech from Sir Robert Peel, he said the whole history of parliamentary legislation for a number of years past has been nothing but the destruction of monopolies. "The Test and Corporation Acts, the Protestant Monopoly in Parliament, the Borough-mongers' Monopoly, have successively fallen. The monopolies of corporators, and that of the East India Company, have also gone down. We are now pursuing monopoly into its last stronghold—we are attacking the monopoly of trade." He concluded by telling his oppo-

nents, that although they might then resist the measures proposed by Government, "yet if they should come into office, those were the measures which a just regard for the finances and commerce of the country would compel them themselves to propose." A remarkable prophecy—anticipating events by just five years. A few nights later a vote of want of confidence was proposed, and the ministers, obtaining a majority of only one, resolved to appeal to the country. The dissolution took place in June. The contest was fought upon the decisive question of Free Trade, and the verdict of the country was unmistakeably against it. Lord John Russell narrowly escaped defeat in the City. Lord Charles Russell lost his seat. Lord Palmerston, more fortunate, was not opposed. The result was a majority of seventy-six for the Conservative party. They were not long in trying their strength; and by way of amendment to the Address to the Queen, at the opening of the Session, moved a resolution to the effect that the ministers did not possess the confidence of the country. The amendment in the Commons was carried by a majority of 29, and in the Lords by a majority of seventy-two. This result had been anticipated, and so, immediately after the resignation of Lord Melbourne's administration, the list of Sir Robert Peel's was announced, and it was found to include not only the old followers of himself and the Duke of Wellington, but also two of the chief seceders from Earl Grey's cabinet, Mr., by this time Lord, Stanley, and Sir James Graham.

Two years before these events, one befel Lord Palmerston which was destined to have an important influence upon his position. He was married to Caroline Lamb, Countess Cowper, sister of his chief, Viscount Melbourne. It is said that he had in younger days been a suitor for her hand, but that she preferred the English Earl to the Irish Viscount. Earl Cowper died in 1837, and two and a half years afterwards, on December 16th, 1839, his widow was married to Lord Palmerston, who had then attained the mature age of fifty-five. This was for the bridegroom a most desirable match. It connected him with many of the most influential families in England. Lady Palmerston's two brothers were childless men, and at their death the whole of their large fortunes devolved upon their sister. Through her, Lord Palmerston became a great territorial magnate. But he owed more to the personal qualities even than to the wealth and the connexions of his wife. No woman was ever more fitted to be the wife of a minister. She was a most admirable tactician. Her fascinations overcame the prejudices of lead-

ing journalists, and converted Lord Palmerston's most inveterate and powerful opponent into a thorough-going supporter. It is not too much to say that the late Premier owed to his wife his long tenure of the highest office under the Crown.

Sir Robert Peel's second administration was occupied chiefly with domestic questions, for not only were these the most urgent, but the Foreign Secretary, Lord Aberdeen, was a thoroughly pacific man. The distress of the country was very great, and bread riots in the manufacturing towns became frequent. Slowly, yet surely, Peel became convinced that there was no cure but one, that one which he had always opposed, and which Palmerston had prophesied that he would be compelled to adopt. He tried a compromise, but only with the effect of inducing his most resolute colleagues to resign. Then came that terrible night, during which the chief crop of Ireland was destroyed. Following upon that, arrived alarming letters from Earl De Grey and Lord Elliot, about the threatening famine, and, as he himself has told us, in his own memorandum on this important event of history, Peel called together his colleagues, told them that the time was come to suspend the Corn Laws, and demanded of them whether they would support him in that course. Suspension so clearly involved ultimate abolition that the "landlords' friends," the once liberal Lord Stanley among the number, could not, even in the prospect of a tremendous calamity, consent to this remedy. Sir Robert resigned, and Lord John Russell was sent for by the Queen, and commissioned to form an administration. He advised his Sovereign to request Lord Stanley to construct a Protectionist cabinet. Lord Stanley found himself unable to do so, and the Whig leader then attempted the task of establishing a stable Government in a Parliament which had given his opponent a very large majority. As the late Premier had promised the new one every assistance in carrying Free Trade, Lord John might have succeeded, had it not been for an unexpected obstacle. Earl Grey positively refused to join the administration if Lord Palmerston were made Foreign Secretary, having a strong dislike of that minister's spirited foreign policy. This objection, raised at such a crisis, has deservedly exposed Earl Grey to censure; the more so, as a few months later he no longer entertained it, and consented to become Lord Palmerston's colleague. His perversity caused his party to lose the *éclat* which they would have derived from abolishing the Corn Laws. Lord John, finding it impossible to form his

administration, abandoned the task, and Peel returned to office, and in defiance of his own colleagues, and by the help of his opponents, as Lord Palmerston had prophesied, he removed the taxes from the people's bread. In doing so, he broke up the Conservative party, which five years before had been so strong. The country gentlemen, who had looked upon him as their champion, soon had an opportunity of revenging themselves upon the "traitor of Tamworth." On the very night that he obtained a triumph by the passing of the third reading of the Corn Laws' Abolition Bill in the House of Lords, he was, by a combination of the Protectionists with the Opposition, defeated on the Irish Coercion Bill by a majority almost exactly the same as that which he had obtained at the general election. On June 29th, he for the last time appeared as a minister, and on that occasion paid a high tribute of praise to the "unadorned eloquence of Richard Cobden." Once more, Lord John Russell was sent for, and this time Earl Grey overcame his repugnance to the foreign policy of Lord Palmerston, and accepted the post of Secretary for the Colonies, while the Foreign Office welcomed back its old occupant. Lord Palmerston's conduct during the Peel administration must be described in very few words. He was a much more frequent speaker than he had been. He repeatedly criticised the policy of the Government, satirically, but without any of that acrid sarcasm which Mr. Disraeli poured upon his late leader. He told the ministers that they were living upon the remains of the feast which their predecessors had provided, and he assured their chief that he would before long do as he had done in 1829, propose the very measure which he had formerly opposed, and that then he might count upon the support of the Opposition. During the great debates on Free Trade, he several times made eloquent speeches, showing that he had wholly abandoned the idea of half measures which he had once entertained. He pointed out that it was "precisely because we had great establishments, because we had a heavy debt, and because we must have a large revenue, that we could not afford to keep up the system of Protection." He added, "If we are compelled to take from every man in the country a large portion of his yearly income to supply the demands of the public service, is that a reason why we should by artificial means purposely make everything which he wants to buy with the remaining part of his income as dear and as bad as we can?"

Reverting to foreign affairs, we find that two of the most

important matters were legacies bequeathed by Lord Palmerston to his successor. The first of these was the Affghan expedition, which at the time that he left office seemed to be perfectly successful, and had undoubtedly produced a strong impression of our power upon the nations of the East. Success led to over-confidence, and over-confidence to a great calamity. For this, Lord Palmerston contended that he was not responsible, but that it arose from the incompetence of the officials on the spot. However the policy of the war in Affghanistan may be questioned, there is little doubt that the disastrous termination of it was not due mainly to Lord Palmerston. It was one of the most serious errors which he committed throughout his whole career, when he undertook to force upon the Affghans a sovereign whom they did not desire, and made war against the prince of their choice. But even this error would not have led to the slaughter of Macnaghten, and that disastrous retreat in which there was but one survivor out of 16,500 men, had it not been for the appointment to the command at Cabul, of a gouty Waterloo general, whose utter unfitness was paralleled sixteen years later at Cawnpore. The other matter was a quarrel with the Emperor of China, brought about in a manner discreditable to this country, and terminated to the advantage of the opium smugglers, whose cause Lord Palmerston espoused, although he told them that they were in the wrong. The only other foreign question of importance which offered during the Peel administration, was the Tahiti dispute, which at one time threatened to involve England and France in war, but which, by the moderation of Lord Aberdeen and M. Guizot, was settled amicably.

The return of Lord Palmerston to the Foreign Office was quickly followed by a serious breach between those two countries. This arose out of the Spanish marriages. By the setting aside of the Treaty of Utrecht, the female descendants of the Spanish sovereign, who had been excluded from the throne by that treaty, were once more made eligible. The Treaty of the "Quadruple Alliance," in 1834, had made Isabella queen to the exclusion of Carlo, brother of the late king. She was a minor, and had a younger sister, Louisa. Their mother, the queen regent, was naturally anxious to see her daughters married in such a way as to give stability to the by no means stable throne. She therefore proposed to Louis Philippe to make a double marriage between her daughters and two sons of the King of France. He, knowing well that England would never consent to an alliance

by which the crowns of France and Spain might eventually be worn by one sovereign, declined half of the proposal, and suggested that Queen Isabella should be married to a descendant of Philip V., in whose reign the Treaty of Utrecht was signed, and that her sister should be married to his son, the Duke of Montpensier, but not until after Queen Isabella had borne two children. By this arrangement Louis Philippe hoped to prevent any jealousy on the part of this country, and also to put a stop to the idea that the Queen of Spain should be married to the cousin of our Prince Consort. The proposal was considered quite satisfactory by Lord Aberdeen; and it was confirmed at private interviews between Queen Victoria and Louis Philippe, which took place in 1842, during visits which those sovereigns paid to each other. As the Spanish princesses were not of marriageable age, the matter was still unsettled when the Whigs returned to office. Immediately afterwards Lord Palmerston wrote a letter to our minister at Madrid, in which he said that the only suitors for the hand of Queen Isabella were Prince Leopold of Saxe Coburg, and the two sons of Don Francisco de Paulo (descendants of Philip V.). The mention of the first, whose exclusion had been one of the principal objects that the French Government had had in view, alarmed Guizot. He came to the conclusion that Palmerston was about to outwit him, as the English minister had done in Syria six years before. He therefore urged upon the King of France to settle the matter at once. Accordingly, although in a communication made by the English minister at Paris it was expressly stated that England did not support the suit of Prince Leopold, and suggested another prince, to whom Guizot said his Government could have no objection, the Queen of Spain was married to Don Francisco of Assisi (a descendant of Philip V.), and on the same day her sister was married to the Duke of Montpensier. As this second marriage was in direct violation of the compact by which the younger Spanish princess was not to be married to Louis Philippe's son until her sister had had two children, the indignation excited in England was intense. Our Queen wrote an autograph letter to her late host and guest complaining of the breach of faith. In reply to Lord Palmerston's complaints, the French minister said, haughtily, that "France had not seen such a day since the Revolution of 1830." The result was a complete rupture of the *entente cordiale* between France and England. It was not restored so long as Louis Philippe was on the throne; and French writers have not hesitated to ascribe the Revolution

of 1848 to the vindictiveness of our Foreign Minister, who, they say, was determined to revenge himself upon the sovereign and the minister who had outwitted him. This accusation is, of course, untenable; but there is no doubt that the animosity produced by the Spanish marriages did induce Lord Palmerston to give a cordial support to the revolution, and to the *coup d'état*. Thus, the duplicity of Louis Philippe, which, inasmuch as the Queen of Spain has had several children, was wholly futile, brought about events which have altered the face of Europe.

The effects of this estrangement were speedily seen. As soon as the three Northern Powers became aware of it, they took advantage of some recent disturbances in Poland to deprive that unhappy country of the little freedom it retained, and the Western Powers being on ill terms, nothing could be done to prevent the wrong. In Switzerland a war had broken out between the Protestant and the Romanist cantons, caused by the expulsion of the Jesuits. The Protestant Guizot espoused the cause of the latter, and requested England and the other great Powers to interpose in order to prevent bloodshed. Lord Palmerston kept Guizot's letter unanswered ten days, and in the meanwhile the Federalists, who possessed the larger army, attacked the troops of the Sonderbund, and obtained a complete victory. About the same time the utmost agitation prevailed in Italy. The miracle of a reforming Pope had appeared, and the scarcely inferior miracles of a Neapolitan Bourbon granting a constitution, and Charles Albert, once the creature of the Jesuits, placing himself at the head of the national party, and leading them against Austria. In these events England had no little share. The Earl of Minto had been sent by Lord Palmerston to Rome in order to report upon the state of Italy; and through all the cities that he passed, Turin, Genoa, Florence, Rome, Naples, and Palermo, he was received as a messenger of good tidings, and as the precursor of liberty. The Italians throughout the Peninsula looked upon this nobleman as the representative of England, and as the pledge of English support. At length the revolution broke out in Palermo, and Lord Minto was besought by both the insurgents and the King to mediate between them. He did his best, obtained the promise of a constitution, which, coming from Ferdinand, was of course worth nothing, and the Sicilians, confident of obtaining the active support of England, continued to fight for independence, until they discovered too late that England was but a broken reed, and that for them defeat was inevitable. At the same

time, the good offices of this country were asked by Austria, in order to prevent the threatened collision with Sardinia. Lord Palmerston declined to accede, on the ground that the Vienna Government did not include Venetia as well as Lombardy in the proposed mediation, so that war broke out, which ended in the disaster of Novara, and the abdication of the broken-hearted Charles Albert. Hungary shared the common belief in the power and the will of England to help the struggling nationalities, and acted accordingly, to find herself, like Sicily and Sardinia, deceived and ruined. Although the guns of the Hungarians had been heard at Vienna, Lord Palmerston refused to recognise the brave people as belligerents, or to receive their envoy. It was not until they were defeated that England interposed, and, sending her fleet to Besika Bay, announced her intention of supporting Turkey by armed assistance in refusing to surrender the Hungarian Generals who had taken refuge in the dominions of the Sultan, and whom Austria demanded. But even this interposition was prompted by selfish motives. It was not for love of the Hungarians, but because England feared that injury to her own interests would arise from violence done to Turkey, that she put forth strength on behalf of the weak. Altogether England played but a sorry figure during the revolutionary storm of 1848-49.

As if to render more marked the failure of Lord Palmerston's policy with regard to the struggling nationalities at this period, there occurred almost immediately afterwards the Don Pacifico episode. This man was a Portuguese Jew, had become a naturalised British subject, and resided at Athens, after a very discreditable career, in which there is reason to believe he was guilty of forgery. At the Easter of 1847, one of the Rothschilds was paying a visit to the Greek capital, and the Government, out of regard to the feelings of its distinguished guest, gave orders that the usual burning of Judas Iscariot, in effigy, by which the mob celebrated the season, should not take place. The people, angry at being deprived of their sport, showed their animosity by committing acts of violence on certain Jews, and amongst them on Pacifico, whose house they sacked. Thereupon this Portuguese-Jew-Englishman, who had been obliged to borrow £30 in order to carry on his business of usurer, made a claim of £7,000 for the value of the property which had been destroyed. The inventory which he wrote out was a marvel of impudence. This man, who had put his spoons in pawn, pretended to have had in his house a sofa worth £170, a bed worth £150, and other articles

after the same rate. The list was most minute. Every item was described, and its value appraised. The contents of each drawer were given in detail, and the catalogue of Mrs. Pacifico's dresses showed that lady to have had the most expensive tastes, and means of gratifying them remarkable in the wife of a man in such straits as the Don. Pacifico's were not the only claims. There was a certain "cannie Scot," who had bought a piece of land for £10 or £20, which was required by the Greek Government, and for which they offered to pay £100. Mr. Finlay, the owner in question, demanded £1,500, and he found a backer in the Foreign Minister of England. There was a further case of two Ionians, who had been marched off to the station-house because they persisted in sleeping in the open streets, and for this trumpety affair Lord Palmerston demanded a payment of £40. The Greek Government unwisely tried evasions instead of boldly refusing to pay: and so after divers shifts and tricks our minister lost patience, ordered our fleet to Athens, seized a number of Greek ships, and held them until the claims were satisfied, in spite of the dignified protest of the cabinet at Athens, and of the remonstrances of the French minister. This high-handed proceeding led to serious disagreements with the French and Russian Governments, and at one time it seemed certain that diplomatic relations between them and our own Government would be broken off. The occasion was not one which Lord Palmerston's political opponents would be likely to neglect. He had many at that time, and among the most bitter of them was the influential journal which five years later hailed him as the saviour of England. The conduct of the Foreign Secretary was made the subject of a vote of censure in the House of Lords. It was moved by the present Earl of Derby, in a most brilliant speech, probably the most effective ever made by him; and after an animated debate, in the course of which Lord Canning and Lord Brougham condemned the proceedings under discussion, the motion was carried by 169 votes to 132. Three days later, in reply to a question from Mr. Roebuck, Lord John Russell stated that the Government did not intend to take any further notice of the adverse decisions in the Upper House, and the member for Bath thereupon gave notice of a resolution to the effect "that the principles which have hitherto regulated the foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government are such as were required to preserve untarnished the honour and dignity of this country, and in time of unexampled difficulty the best qualified to maintain peace between England and the various nations of the world."

Considering that it was then uncertain if France and Russia would not withdraw their ambassadors, and that only two years before our minister had been ordered to leave Madrid in forty-eight hours, this was a bold statement to make. The resolution was skilfully as well as boldly worded, for it embraced the whole of Lord Palmerston's foreign policy, and gave those Liberal ministers who disapproved of the conduct of the Secretary in the Pacifico affair, an opportunity of escaping from the necessity of voting against him. The debate that followed was one of the most memorable since the passing of the Reform Bill. It lasted four nights, and at four o'clock in the morning of June 28th the division took place, and in a House of 579 members the Government obtained a majority of forty-six votes, although opposed by Peel, Graham, Gladstone, Sidney Herbert, Milner Gibson and Bright. Lord Palmerston himself spoke on the second night, and his defence lasted for five hours, during which he did not once stop to take even a glass of water. He reviewed his whole foreign policy, and after contending with reference to the Pacifico affair that it was not the amount, but the principle of the claim, upon which the two Governments were at issue, he concluded as follows: "While we have seen the political earthquake rocking Europe from side to side; while we have seen thrones shaken, shattered, levelled; institutions overthrown and destroyed; while in almost every country in Europe the conflict of civil war has deluged the land with blood, from the Atlantic to the Black Sea, from the Baltic to the Mediterranean; this country has presented a spectacle honourable to the people of England, and worthy of the admiration of mankind. We have shown that liberty is compatible with order, that individual freedom is reconcilable with obedience to the law. We have shown the example of a nation in which every class of society accepts with cheerfulness the lot which Providence has assigned to it, while at the same time every individual of each class is constantly striving to raise himself in the social scale—not by injustice and wrong, not by violence and illegality, but by persevering good conduct and by the steady and energetic exertion of the moral and intellectual faculties with which his Creator has endowed him. To govern such a people as this is indeed worthy of the ambition of the noblest man who lives in this land, and therefore I find no fault with those who may think any opportunity a fair one for endeavouring to place themselves in so distinguished and honourable a position. But I contend that we have not in our foreign policy done anything to forfeit the confidence of the country. . . . I main-

tain that the principles which can be traced through all our foreign transactions, as the guiding rule and directing spirit of the proceedings, are such as deserve approbation. I, therefore, fearlessly challenge the verdict which this House, as representing a political, a commercial, a constitutional country, is to give on this question now brought before it: whether the principles on which the foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government has been conducted, and the sense of duty which has led us to think ourselves bound to afford protection to our fellow-subjects abroad, are proper and fitting guides for those who are charged with the government of England, and whether, as the Roman in the days of old held himself free from indignity when he could say *Civis Romanus sum*, so also a British subject, in whatever land he may be, shall feel confident that the watchful eye and the strong arm of England will protect him against injustice and wrong."

This speech produced a profound impression. Mr. Gladstone, in attacking Lord Palmerston, said, "It was remarkable alike as a physical and as an intellectual effort; and no man, even of those who sat beside him, listened with keener admiration and delight, while from the dusk of one day until the dawn of the next he defended his policy, and through the live-long summer's night the British House of Commons, crowded as it was, hung upon his lips." The debate, which preceded and followed, was worthy of it. It was memorable amongst other things for having secured to the present Lord Chief Justice of England his high position, as the reward for his most eloquent defence, and also for having given an opportunity to the late Sir Robert Peel to deny, in the last speech which he ever made, and within a week of his death, that there had been any combination between the Tories and the Radicals to overturn the administration. Outside the House the impression was equally great; and a few days later, the especial admirers of Lord Palmerston, numbering ninety M.P.s, presented Lady Palmerston with a full-length portrait of her husband, as a token of their admiration of him.

The close of 1850 was marked by an event which produced the greatest possible excitement at the time—the division of England into dioceses by the Pope. It led to the famous letter from Lord John Russell to the Bishop of Durham, and to the introduction of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, in February, 1851. This abortive measure Lord Palmerston supported by his speech and vote, and he expressed his regret that the concession of 1829 had met with so unworthy a return. The close of that memorable year—the year of the

first International Exhibition, and of the *coup d'état*—saw Lord Palmerston suddenly ejected from office. He was removed at the request of his own colleague, and without concert with the rest of the cabinet. This course was so unusual, and the reason suggested for it so inadequate, it being, in fact, merely a breach of etiquette of which Lord Palmerston had been guilty, that it is impossible to suppose that there were not other causes which led to his removal. The Foreign Minister had expressed, in a private conversation with the French Ambassador, as many other members of the cabinet also did, his approval of the *coup d'état*, or rather, his hope that it might lead to the welfare of France. Count Walewski reported the conversation to his Government, a member of which in turn mentioned it to our minister at Paris, who felt aggrieved that in the despatch which he had received from the Foreign Office, Lord Palmerston had not expressed himself so decisively as he had done in conversation. Lord Normanby's letter of complaint brought the discrepancy before the Queen, and induced her to seek an explanation from Lord John Russell. He referred the matter to Lord Palmerston, who, undoubtedly, was more tardy in giving an answer than he should have been, and the Premier thereupon gave him his *congé*, offering him in vain the Viceroyalty of Ireland, as a compensation. In a long explanation, which the two ministers made at the opening of the succeeding session, it was very clear that Lord John had for some time past not been on good terms with his Foreign Minister. It did not appear, but it was the general belief at the time, that Lord Palmerston was sacrificed to a foreign cabal, long in existence, but which had become more bitter in consequence of an imprudent speech which he had delivered in reply to a deputation from Islington, and which he himself afterwards regretted. The existence of such a cabal Lord John Russell had himself admitted, when defending his colleague in 1850. Since then the powerful influence of the Prince Consort had been exerted against the Foreign Minister.

We must hasten over the last fourteen years of Lord Palmerston's life. Although more fertile of events important to him than any that had preceded, their history is too recent to need a detailed recapitulation. Lord Derby's administration lasted just ten months, during which that Treaty of London was signed which was destined twelve years later to be counted as so much waste paper by two of the signatories, and which, intended to preserve the integrity of Denmark, rendered its dismemberment the more easy. At the general

election which took place in the summer of 1852, Protection received its quietus. Lord Palmerston was returned without opposition for his little Devonshire borough, now become almost his *peculium*. In December, Mr. Disraeli's first essay as a financier involved his colleagues in defeat and overthrow; and the Peelites, whom Lord Derby had in vain endeavoured to win over, joined with the Whigs to make one of the most brilliant administrations ever known. Mr. Disraeli nick-named it "All the Talents," and it had a career of almost exactly the same duration as Lord Grenville's cabinet forty-seven years before. It was determined that Lord Palmerston should not be placed at the Foreign Office, for it would have been impossible that there he could have worked harmoniously with his old antagonist, and then chief, the Earl of Aberdeen. At the same time, he had shown ten months before that he could not safely be left out of office, so he was appointed Home Secretary. This was very like putting Pegasus to a pugmill, or making a policeman out of a circumnavigator. It is to Lord Palmerston's credit, that having undertaken the duties of this department, he not only performed them as well as any other minister could have done, but far better. He threw all his energy into the work. Debarred from the pleasure of bullying despots, he worried the tyrants of the street—the cab-drivers. Deprived of the power of despatching admirals to bombard the capitals of refractory sovereigns, he made a raid upon the smoky chimneys of the metropolis. But while his hand was felt at the Home Office, his heart was at the Foreign Office. The cloud that had been for many years gathering was fast overspreading the East, and the minister who had twice sent the British fleet to the entrance of the Hellespont, saw that the time was coming when that far-famed gate, like the Temple of Janus, shut in time of peace, and opened in time of war, would have to be passed. His colleagues were not so quick in reading the signs of the times. So on a day in December, just two years after that December morning when he had been ejected from office, the world was very much astonished to hear that Lord Palmerston had resigned again, and asked whether there was something fatal in the season to the statesman. The explanation given at the time was that Lord Palmerston disapproved of the Reform Bill which his former rival was bent upon passing. The real cause was far otherwise. He had his own ideas upon the Eastern question, ideas cherished throughout his lifetime, and unless he could see some prospect of realising them, he resolved not to

continue in office. His speedy return to his post proved that he had succeeded in obtaining some kind of guarantee as to the future, and the entry of the allied fleets into the Black Sea, about three weeks later, in reply to the Sultan's request made just before Lord Palmerston's resignation, enables the student of contemporary politics to form a shrewd guess about events that are too recent to be fully revealed. The "long canker of peace" had, if not eaten into the national morals, as the Laureate declared it had, at least impaired our military resources. So when, after forty years of tranquillity, we were called upon to conduct a great war 3,000 miles from home, we found ourselves incompetent to the task, and the nation grew impatient with the conductors of the war. They were turned out of office by perhaps the largest majority which ever defeated a government; and while, according to etiquette, Lord Derby was sent for to form a new administration, the whole nation fretted until that was accomplished which every one had foreseen must happen, and Lord Palmerston, at the age of seventy-one, at last found himself at the head of a cabinet. It was a poor collection, so far as statesmanship went; but the new Premier had the advantage of the great preparations which his predecessors had made, but which they were not allowed to test; and the war being concluded in 1856, he obtained all the credit of restored peace.

The humbling of Russia at Sebastopol gave Palmerston an admirable opportunity for pushing his anti-Russian policy in Asia. Almost simultaneously, he punished the Persians for attacking the Afghan stronghold of Herat, and declared war against China, for the "outrage" committed upon the *lorcha* "Arrow," a pirate ship which had been licensed to carry the British flag at twopence a-day. The bombardment of Canton which was ordered by Sir John Bowring in revenge, became the subject of one of the most animated debates which even Lord Palmerston had seen. The Peelites, who had retired when he had consented to the appointment of the Sebastopol Enquiry Commission, and Lord John Russell, who had resigned on account of his diplomatic failure at Vienna, together with the Radicals, joined the Conservatives in a vote of censure upon Sir John Bowring, which was carried by a majority of sixteen. Lord Palmerston then dissolved. This he had a perfect right to do, for the existing Parliament had been elected by his opponents, and had attained the average duration. An appeal to the country obtained such a response as no minister since William Pitt had elicited. The leading

Radicals were ignominiously defeated in the large towns, and one-half of the Conservative candidates found it necessary to declare themselves Palmerstonians, in order to win. A lucky mistake, if indeed it was not something worse, helped to complete Lord Palmerston's triumph. It was announced by the *Times* (by this time converted from the most bitter opponent, into the most fervid adherent of the Premier), on the day appointed for most of the nominations, that our chief antagonist, Yeh, had surrendered, and as nothing succeeds like success, this news was made the most of by the ministerial supporters. The result was, that Lord Palmerston obtained an extraordinary majority of professed followers. This signal triumph was too much for him. Upon the assembling of the new Parliament, he displayed an insolence quite foreign from his ordinary habits. He spared not the most distinguished of those members who differed from him, and the Session of 1857 will long be remembered for the bitter personalities which passed between him and Mr. Gladstone upon the Divorce Bill. Certain appointments in Church and State tended still further to alienate the House of Commons from him; and the Conservatives who had gained seats as his admirers, saw that the time was come when they might throw off their temporary allegiance. As on the last occasion, Lord Palmerston's fall from office was caused by an event which took place in Paris. The attempt of Orsini, January 16th, 1858, to assassinate the Emperor Napoleon in accordance with a plot devised in this country, excited the most intense indignation against England, and the colonels in the French army demanded to be led against this country forthwith. Lord Palmerston, either out of regard to the Sovereign with whom he had always endeavoured to maintain friendship, or because he really feared war, attempted to modify the law which permitted refugees to conspire against a foreign sovereign. Once more there was, as Lord Palmerston said, "a fortuitous concurrence of atoms"—Conservatives, Peelites and Radicals united—and in Lord Palmerston's own Parliament defeated him by a majority of nineteen. It was a very severe reverse, coming within a year after his great triumph, and the Premier felt it to be so. There was no remedying it; and when the numbers of the division were announced, he sat for a time with face hidden, so that the excited gazers could not see the emotions which would otherwise have made themselves visible. Resignation was, of course, inevitable, and on February 19th it took place. Then came the second Derby-Disraeli adminis-

tration, destined to a little longer life than the first, but not to attain to eighteen months. Nevertheless, it sustained one memorable attack, that which Montalembert has immortalised in his *Débat sur l'Inde*, wherein he has told how in the very climax of a parliamentary conflict, the combatants paused, and adjourned to take part in the great annual holiday on the Surrey Downs, where rival statesmen became rival sportsmen, and the late and the actual Premier contended for the blue ribbon of the turf. The assault upon the Government failed signally, and Mr. Cardwell, who led it, did not even press his motion to a division. The next year the Conservatives brought in their promised Reform Bill, were defeated upon it, appealed to the country, and appealed in vain, for the elections left them in a minority. Then the various sections of the Liberal party resolved to forget their differences; and Mr. Gladstone having at last consented to join an administration, the celebrated compact was made at Willis's Rooms, whereby the Derbyites were to be ousted, the spoils of office divided among the assailants, and another Reform Bill brought in. As soon as the new Parliament had met, a vote of want of confidence was passed by a majority of thirteen, and the new cabinet came into office. How far the programme as regards Reform was carried out our readers must remember. The measure was laughed out of the House, and Lord Palmerston cared not to rescue his colleagues from the disgrace of another failure, such as he had encountered six years before. In his foreign policy he was greatly hampered by the strongly pacific tendencies of many of his colleagues. This was especially apparent in the Dano-German Question. There is no doubt that he would have prevented the invasion of Denmark at the outset, if it had not been for the opposition which he encountered in his own cabinet, and from his Sovereign. His speech, delivered on July 4, 1864, shows how he chafed under the restraint which was put upon him; and the concluding sentence, in which he depicted Copenhagen bombarded, King Christian in chains, and her Majesty's ministers then meeting to consider what they should do, contained far keener satire than any of the speeches from the Opposition, or from the members below the gangway. In one instance he had an opportunity of displaying his traditional vigour, and although Earl Russell was at the Foreign Office, there is no mistaking the "fine Roman hand" in the despatches which brought Mr. Seward to reason, and obtained redress for the insult that had been offered to our flag by the sea-lawyer, Captain Wilkes. On one occasion he had an opportunity of repaying

his "noble friend" the treatment which he had received in December, 1851. It had always been a part of Lord Palmerston's policy to avoid active intervention in behalf of Poland, however cruel the treatment to which she was subjected by her masters. Lord Russell was, in 1863, for once more warlike than his colleague; and, finding that he could not carry out his designs, nor effect anything for the Poles, he wrote a despatch, in which he declared that, Russia having violated the Treaty of Vienna, England would no longer recognise her rights in Poland conferred by that treaty. The effect of this despatch would have been to make Russia feel herself entirely free to work her own will in Poland. The Premier speedily discovered what his colleague had done, and telegraphed to our ambassador at St. Petersburg not to present the despatch. Having little scope for an offensive policy, Lord Palmerston devoted his energies to increasing the defences of the country, and caused those works to be erected which will probably, before long, be viewed with as much ridicule as are the martello towers of his great predecessor, William Pitt. Nor was it only in this way that he had to act on the defensive. The last Parliament was elected by his antagonists. Nevertheless, by skilful manœuvres, Lord Palmerston converted it to his side so completely, that, although repeatedly advised to dissolve, he refused to do so, but permitted it to run its full course. Then, at the height of his popularity, this octogenarian statesman went joyfully down to his old friends at Tiverton, obtained from them and from the country generally a decisive approval of his policy, and before he could meet the Parliament in whose constitution his name had had such influence, he passed away; his mind to the last engrossed by that wide sphere of foreign policy to which he had devoted the greater part of his active life.

Such was the career of the minister whom we have just laid amongst England's greatest statesmen. The events in which he played so large a part are mostly too recent for us to estimate that part perfectly. Nevertheless, we cannot believe that Lord Palmerston will hereafter be numbered among England's chief leaders, albeit he was the most popular. This popularity arose partly from the belief that he had before all things England's interests at heart, but chiefly from circumstances independent of his policy. It was his tact, his rarely failing good temper, his thorough knowledge of the English character, his readiness to detect, and adroitness in complying with, the popular wishes, and latterly his hale and hearty old age, that gained for him the applause

which greeted him wherever he went. Men, his juniors by a quarter of a century, sank exhausted to death under the toils which to him were but sport, and under the responsibilities which, according to his own confession, he never felt. His fame has been more widely spread than that of any of his predecessors, for he was determined to make England's influence felt in every part of the world. To many persons this determination may seem the highest policy. We cannot admit it to be so. The nature of England's influence we hold to be of far more importance than its extent. It is impossible to affirm that in Lord Palmerston's hands that influence has always been for good. He was, as Dean Stanley has lately said of him, "an Englishman to excess." Amid many apparent inconsistencies he was really entirely consistent. There was one idea to which he adhered through life, that public opinion was the source of all international strength. Believing that, Lord Palmerston held that England must never risk defeat even in a righteous cause, nor neglect a victory even though won by might at the expense of right. Thus the policy was perfectly consistent which, on the one hand, allowed Russia to assist Austria in the subjugation of Hungary, which permitted the Sicilians, who had relied upon the assistance of England, to be restored to the tender mercies of a "Bomba," and which suffered the Poles to be thrice wasted by the Northern Powers; and which, on the other hand, sent a fleet to Athens to enforce payment for a usurer's bedstead, which supported the claim that he himself had condemned, made by our smuggling opium merchants upon the Government of China, and which bombarded Canton with red-hot cannon balls because a private ship carrying English colours had been seized by Chinese sailors. England, he would have said, cannot afford to be in the wrong. He would have meant, that England cannot afford to admit herself in the wrong. So he avoided contests for the right unless victory was secure, and too often contended for victory without regard to the right. He could not conceive it possible that England's position might be better, nobler, stronger, as the sole though unsuccessful advocate of justice, than as the invariable victor in every conflict wherein she engaged. He was no Cato; the beaten cause found no favour in his eyes. He was a clever, but not a great man. He was the minister of his own time, not the statesman of all time.

BRIEF LITERARY NOTICES.

Jubilee Memorials of the Wesleyan Mission in South Ceylon, 1814—1864. By Robert Spence Hardy. Colombo: 1864.

THE writer of these Memorials, well known to students of Oriental literature as the author of two elaborate and standard books on the religion of Gotama Buddha (*Eastern Monachism*, which appeared in 1850, and *A Manual of Buddhism*, published three years later), and equally well known in the world of Christian enterprise as in time past, for many years, a devoted and successful missionary of the Wesleyan Society among the Buddhists of Ceylon, has just reached England, as we are informed, after accomplishing a two years' visit to the scene of his former labours, undertaken at the request of the Directors of the Wesleyan Missions, the object of the visit being to carry out certain ecclesiastical arrangements rendered necessary by a crisis in the history of the Society's operations in that part of its field of foreign service.

During the brief space of this second residence in Ceylon, Mr. Hardy was not simply content with securing the special ends contemplated by his mission, and with performing, besides, a vast amount of directly ministerial duty both in the pulpit and out of it: he found time likewise—we know not how—to compose and publish on the spot at least two important works connected with the history and existing state of Singhalese missions, particularly as conducted by the agents of the Wesleyan Missionary Society. The former of these works, entitled *The Sacred Books of the Buddhists compared with History and Modern Science*, was written in view of the great religious controversy at present raging in South Ceylon, between Buddhism and Christianity, and is a telling exposure of the weakness of the former system as tested by historic facts, and by the discoveries of modern astronomy, geology, and other branches of inductive physics. The latter of the two books—the work before us—is a detailed account of the Wesleyan Missions in South Ceylon, from their establishment in 1814, to their first jubilee; coupled and interspersed, however, with reference to the history of the island, and to the character, habits, faith, and social life of the Singhalese, which give an interest to the narrative beyond even that of its proper topics, and of the sprightly, animated manner in which they are treated by the author.

We cannot pretend to follow Mr. Hardy through the two or three hundred pages which he devotes to the annals of the Wesleyan Mission in the south of this island. We trust many of our readers, not

Wesleyans only, will do themselves the privilege of studying so important and graphic a piece of modern ecclesiastical history. It is anything rather than dull biography and unmeaning statistics; while the author's plan obliges him to go into detail, he writes with such enthusiasm of sympathy, such fulness of knowledge, such movement and quiet vivacity, such humour of style, that what with the intrinsic interest of the facts, and the perpetual interweaving among them of threads and spangles of philology, science, description, and the like, the reader is borne as by enchantment through a course which, under other guidance, would be impassable, except for the few to whom circumstances might make it the path of Christian or literary duty.

As it is, Mr. Hardy's account of the founding of the Wesleyan Mission in South Ceylon, of the establishment and after history of its several "stations," and of the present number, condition, and prospects of its agencies, has all the variety and charm of a well constructed diorama, and will not fail to rivet the attention of readers whose tastes are elevated enough to appreciate the author's subject and his handling of it. The affecting story of the death on shipboard of Dr. Coke, the leader of the noble band of Wesleyan missionaries who first set foot in Ceylon; the strangely-mingled circumstances of encouragement and difficulty under which the pioneering work of the mission was accomplished; how Messrs. Lynch and Squance established themselves among the waters and cinnamon gardens of the chief town, Colombo, and how they and their successors struggled, and lost, and won, and still laboured; the curious episode connected with Colombo, of the profession of Christianity by two Buddhist priests, and their baptism in England by Dr. Adam Clarke; the up-hill evangelizing in gambling, cock-fighting, morotto; the successes of the missionaries in Romish Negombo, the first town on the coast northward, and in Seedua, and adjoining villages, some distance inland; the formidableness of the barriers which the official relations between the British Government and heathenism long threw in the way of Christian enterprise in the magnificent, blood-drenched Kandy country of the interior; the various fortunes of the truth as preached and taught in Morotto, Pantura, Caltura, and Amblamgoda; the kindness which the missionaries experienced on their landing fifty years ago in Galle, the well-known Ceylonese town, of which our author gives a lively picturesque description, and their subsequent, though not very rapid or conspicuous, prosperity; Mr. Rippon's interesting narrative of his visit, not by express trains, in 1854, to Goddapitiya; the alternations of rise and fall which characterised the Matura Mission, in the extreme south of the island, with the tragedy of the crimes and execution of the boy murderer hung there in 1845; the disappointments which the missionaries have suffered in the sacred village of Dardra, and how the great Pali scholar and literary foeman of Buddhism, recently deceased, Mr. Gogerly, formerly lived and studied in it; the exertions put forth by Wesleyan missionaries in Ceylon on behalf of British soldiers; the benefits which have accrued to women in the island from the educa-

tional and evangelistic operations of Christianity; the particulars of the extraordinary activity displayed of late by the Buddhists in the endeavour to maintain their own belief and observances, as against the advances of the Gospel; these are only specimens of a multitude of points to which our author addresses himself, and which he discusses and illustrates with admirable judgment, vigour, and effort.

Mr. Hardy's account of the contemporary "Buddhist Controversy," is one of the most interesting chapters of his book; and want of space alone prevents us from narrating in full the circumstances under which so mighty a resistance to Christianity on the part of the Buddhism of Ceylon began, and the phases through which the conflict between the opposing powers has passed up to the present time. That the disciples of Buddha are not likely to yield to Christianity through any want of theological adroitness and subtlety, will appear from a circumstance which occurred as far back as the year 1826, and which we venture, at the risk of a lengthened quotation, to relate in the words of Mr. Hardy.

"Until the year 1826 [the priests] seemed to take very little notice, even when some of their most learned and respectable adherents forsook their ranks. At that time a number of slips were printed, and distributed among the pilgrims on their way to the festival at Kalány. The first of these papers was entitled, '*Important Information*,' and contained the passage, '*We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth*' (1 Cor. viii. 4, 5). The second was entitled, '*Good News*,' and contained the passage, '*God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life*' (John iii. 15). The third was entitled, '*Divine Instruction*,' and contained the passage, '*There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus*' (1 Tim. ii. 5). There are several others, such as '*An Important Enquiry*,' and '*Advice from a Christian Friend*.' [Soon after the papers were distributed] the teacher of the Nágalgans school was taking an evening walk on the way to Kaláng towards the Bridge of Boats, which is the principal thoroughfare for the many thousands who visit the far-famed temple at that place, when he saw the [first] four papers [above mentioned] fixed to a tree, under which four parodies were written. The titles were the same as the originals, but the parody on the first passage was as follows: '*We know that there is no God who is the giver of all good, and who lives for ever, existing in time past, present, and to come; and that none but Buddha is the creator and donor of all sorrow-destroying tranquillity*.' The second ran thus: '*The present Buddha, before he attained to Buddhaship, so much (or so infinitely) pitied Máraya, and all beings, in every world, that resolving to become Buddha, he came down from heaven, and though on approaching the seat of Buddhaship, his design was opposed by the Déwa Máraya, with his host, yet, having conquered and put him to flight, he became Supreme Buddha, in order that all that believe on*

him should not perish, but obtain the happiness of Niarwána.' The third was thus: 'He who delights in the glorious sermons of the all-wise Buddha, more divine than the gods, who receives no false doctrine, and who perseveres in the performance of the meritorious actions, shall obtain divine and human enjoyments with all other eternal blessings.' And the fourth was as follows: 'What is the difference between the true believer, and the believer in the false religion? The believer in the false religion credits the following falsehoods, namely, that there are no former births, and that after we pass by death from this world there will be no future births, and that all who have died, and been laid in their graves, shall rise at once, at a certain appointed time, all going to one heaven or to one hell, will there endure everlasting misery or enjoy eternal happiness, and that afterwards this world will have no existence. But the true believer confides in the declaration of all-wise Buddha, and believes that, as he is taught, all men will receive that kind and degree of suffering and enjoyment which agrees with the merit or demerit of their conduct.'"

We cannot now dwell upon the results of this remarkable answer to the challenge of Christianity. They are told by Mr. Hardy. The object of our quotation is simply to show—as we conceive it does very strikingly show—that an earnest controversial struggle between Buddhism and the Gospel is not likely to be child's play, and that unless higher than human forces take the field against the faith once delivered by Gotama Buddha, the prejudice, ingenuity, and sophistical theosophizing of its adherents will hardly give place before the weapons of European enlightenment and logic, though wielded by Christian hands.

We are informed that Messrs. Williams and Norgate are about to publish a new and improved edition of the former of Mr. Hardy's two latest works above mentioned. It will gratify us to hear that his *Jubilee Memorials*, subject to such rearrangement and alteration as, we believe, he will be wishful, with increased leisure, to make in them, are also in the way of obtaining a much larger circulation than the copies already in print are able to give to them. We earnestly trust, likewise, that the learned author of our *Standards on Buddhism* will lose no time in conferring upon the literary and religious world two other benefits which he, of all living men, is best qualified to bestow: 1. That he will collect and edit with explanatory notes the scattered but invaluable papers—only too few, alas!—on the Pali language and literature, and on the doctrines and observances of Buddhism, published in various forms by the late Mr. Gogerly, together with the hitherto unpublished Dictionary of the Pali—incomplete indeed, yet most precious—as found among the MSS. of this great Orientalist after his decease; and 2. That Mr. Hardy will send forth, at his earliest convenience, that original analysis of some of the sacred books of the Buddhists, which, we have reason to know, he has been able recently to make, partly from the Pali document themselves, partly from Singhalese translations, and the knowledge of which, as possessed by Western scholars, can hardly fail at once to promote, in some

degree at least, the highest intellectual and religious well-being of mankind.

With many thanks to the learned writer of these *Mémorials*, we commend this good fruit of his late missionary expedition to all lovers of the noble literature which it so worthily represents and adorns.

Israel in the Wilderness; or, Gleanings from the Scenes of the Wanderings. By the Rev. Charles Forster, B.D.
London: Bentley. 1865.

MR. FORSTER is well known for the ingenuity and enthusiasm with which he has advocated the Israelitish origin of the famous rock-inscriptions of the Wadi Mokatteb and other parts of the Sinaitic Peninsula. He has been heartily laughed at—not least by a multitude who never weighed his arguments, or ever read the books which contained them—and, we suppose, he has been successful in making but few converts to his doctrine. He would have had better chance of success, if his investigations had been less manifestly empirical; if he had been judicious enough to avoid mixing up the dubious and visionary with what was morally certain or highly probable; and if his general tone had evinced, on the one hand, a more subdued confidence in his own views and conclusions, and on the other, a more generous feeling towards those who disagreed with him in their explanations of the phenomena with which he dealt. In the volume before us, there is less empiricism than in “The One Primeval Language;” and the author’s judgment appears, perhaps, on the whole, to have gained by the progress of years. But we cannot congratulate Mr. Forster upon any improvement in the temper and tone of his writing. We will not yield to Mr. Forster, or to any one, in abhorrence of what ought to be intended by *rationalism*. The ignorance, arrogance, flippancy, conceit, and utter heathenishness of a philosophy which shuts its eyes on principle to everything outside the sphere of the sensible and intellectually definable, and which makes it its business to reduce God to a mere personification of an infinite good nature, awaken in us as intense a moral contempt and indignation as can exist in human breasts. At the same time we protest against the indiscriminate brandishing of so bad a name. The very badness of it demands that it be used with caution and forbearance. Justice, as well as mercy, insists that it shall be so. Mr. Forster is not sufficiently careful in this matter. He is too prone to cry *Rationalist*. It is, no doubt, true that some of the theories which he combats have their origin, in whole or part, in rationalistic prejudices and prepossessions. But he has no right to assume that this is so generally the case as he represents it to be. It may be very absurd to make the Sinaitic inscriptions the work of Amalekites, Horites, or what not: but it does not follow that the theorists who have so imagined, have framed their hypotheses under the spell of Rationalism; and we do not believe that this miserable

parentage can be truthfully affirmed of them in mass. In point of fact, Mr. Forster's doctrine is cumbered with a difficulty, which may very well excuse some counter speculation. If the Israelites of the Exode were the authors of the Sinaitic inscriptions, it seems reasonable to expect that they should be written in Hebrew—the Hebrew of Moses and the Pentateuch. Now, so far as the tentative deciphering, either of Mr. Forster or of any other scholar, has yet been able to determine, the inscriptions are not Hebrew. As the *antique*-sellers of modern Egypt are accustomed to say of their forgeries, when they see they are detected, the inscriptions may be *like* Hebrew, but they are not, so far as we can judge, what they ought to be, the very thing itself. Surely this is a serious hindrance in the way of accepting Mr. Forster's hypothesis: and so long as he cannot dispose of it, he is bound to be tolerant of theories which, whatever other embarrassments they may labour under, are not open, at first sight, to this most formidable impeachment. With respect to the inscriptions, we are satisfied—first, that they are of enormous antiquity; there is no reason why the bulk of them should not be as old as the oldest extant Egyptian monuments—secondly, that they were cut, for the most part, at about the same period, by a multitude of persons, living for a long while together in the places at which they are found, and having boundless leisure at their command for cutting them; and, thirdly, that with the exceptions of certain obviously modern writings in Greek, Coptic, Latin, and Arabic, they are the work of a people belonging to an ancient branch of the Shemitish stock of nations. Further than this, we are strongly inclined to believe, with Mr. Forster's facts and arguments before us, that the inscriptions do connect themselves with the forty years' wandering, and that they are in fact, in some way or other, Israelitish in their origin. At present, however, we are not fully satisfied. The linguistic stumblingblock remains; and we do not see how Mr. Forster's theory can possibly be accepted, at least in the form in which it now appears, so long as it remains. The recent discovery of the bilingual inscriptions, partly hieroglyphical, partly "Sinaitic," in the Wady Maghara, is an important addition to the evidence previously in our hands as to the authorship of the rock-writings; and time will probably add much more to this evidence. Meanwhile, let induction do its duty, and faith fear nothing, and charity minister to both. Whatever may be thought of the scientific value of Mr. Forster's "Israel in the Wilderness," we promise the readers of it abundant instruction and pleasure. His interesting descriptive account of the inscriptions of the peninsula; his able discussion of Beer's untenable hypothesis as to their Christian origin; his graphic narrative of the finding by Mr. Butler of the now famous ostrich tablet in the cave at Gebel Maghara; his exciting exposition of what he takes to be the meaning of the hieroglyphical inscriptions at Sarbut-el-Khadem, the supposed Kibroth-hattaavah of Numbers xi. 34; and his extended and often important observations on the site of Kadesh-Barnea, on the battle of Hormah, on the mount of the Golden Calf, on the identity of

Serbal and the Mosaic Sinai, on the Stations in the Wilderness, and on other topics connected with his main point, are worthy of the best attention of Biblical scholars and students of every school. We shall be unfeignedly glad, if Mr. Forster's doctrine, subject to certain inevitable modifications, should turn out to be the true key to the phenomena which it is intended to account for; and we think it far more likely than otherwise, that this will be the fact.

Adam and the Adamite; or, the Harmony of Scripture and Ethnology. By Dominick M'Causland, Q.C., LL.D. London: Bentley. 1864.

FLINT implements, lake villages, and human remains in bone caves have raised new difficulties over the Scripture account of the beginning of man on the earth: and, as might be expected, the friends of revelation have shown a laudable anxiety to meet and dispose of these difficulties. It is to be regretted, that, in some cases, this feeling has not gone hand in hand with wisdom. Sometimes the scientific facts have been misunderstood, ignored, caricatured, twisted; quite as often the text of Holy Writ has been blundered over, distorted, and made to yield whatever meaning the advocate thought it ought to yield under the circumstances. We are loth to reckon the author of *Sermons in Stones* as belonging to either of these classes of writers: yet we know not how to avoid putting his present work into the latter of our categories. In presence of the discoveries to which we have pointed, and of the ethnological consequences which Dr. M'Causland believes to follow from them, he is at a loss to understand how the human race in all its branches can have descended, as the Bible appears to say it does, from a single pair created somewhere in the neighbourhood of the Tigris and Euphrates, not more than six or seven thousand years ago. At the same time he is satisfied that the Books of Moses are Divinely inspired, and must be accepted by all Christian men as records of truth and matter of fact. And in this dilemma the author frames a theory which shall harmonise everything. The Bible is the history not of all human beings, but of culminating and climactic man, of Adam and the race of Adam. *Ish*, inferior man, was created long before, if not at different epochs, yet at several distinct centres in the area of the earth. Hence the human remains in the bone caverns. Hence the inhabitants of many of the remoter and less accessible regions of the globe in our own days. The founder of the Adamite race, the highest type of man, was brought into being at the time and under the circumstances stated in Scripture; and it is primarily to him and his offspring that the whole body of Divine Revelation has reference. It is the Adamite who is redeemed; and it is through the Adamite alone, that the benefits of the redemption are to be extended to the *ish* in all his varieties of organization, character, and social and moral circumstances. This is Dr. M'Causland's doctrine in brief. In his book

it is drawn out at length, and is argued and defended with the well-known ability and skill of the accomplished author. It is surely a monstrous theory. Whatever science may say to it—and we do not expect that the ethnologists will accord it a very open-armed welcome—there can be but one judgment upon it amongst those who interpret Hebrew as they would Latin or Greek; who accept the Scriptures as expressly claiming to be a revelation from God to the whole human population of the earth, considered as of one and the same Divine parentage; and who must read the Gospel backwards, if Christ be not, in the same respects, and to the same extent, the Saviour of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues. Dr. M'Causland has attempted to harmonise. We do not believe in harmonies; at least, we do not believe in schemes of accommodation, which clearly settle all differences between the Bible and science, and bring the Divine within the sharply-drawn lines of our imperious and self-satisfied inductions and their attendant logic. Dr. M'Causland's book is the fruit of an excellent intention; but it is premature, crude, and inconclusive. Much better—so we judge—that the difficulties as between science and revelation should remain where they are, than that they should be got rid of by force of theories which do not comprehend the whole of the case, and which inflict manifest wrong on one side or the other of the systems of fact to which they are applied.

INDEX

TO

VOLUME XXV.

'Adam and the Adamite,' 531.

American Methodism, 190.

Arabia, 'Palgrave's Travels,' 136; Bedouin, 141; camel, 143; diseases, 159.

Arianism of the Lombards, 46.

Barlow's work on Dante, 30.

Bible-women's Association in London, 181.

Brindley and the Early Engineers, 58; early engineering works, 59; Lincolnshire Fens, 61; Fen slodgers, 63; New River, 65; Sir Hugh Middleton, 67; Dagenham Breach, 69; Duke of Bridgewater, 77; New Canal, 79; Josiah Wedgewood, 85.

Calderwood, Mr., 425.

Carlovingian Dynasty, 32; coloni and serfs, 43; nature of government, 45; church, 47; Charlemagne, 49; Church and State, 53.

Carlyle on Dante, 15.

Cary's Dante, 29.

Catholicism in Russia, 89; schism between east and west, 91; statistics of creeds, 73; mission of Jesuit Possevin, 103; conversion of Poland to Popery, 109; Romanising Czar Demetrius, 111; anti-Romish policy of Catherine, 123; her management of the Jesuits, 125; Alexander and the Jesuits, 133.

Charlemagne, 48.

Christian Certainty, 257.

Church of Scotland—Genius of Scottish Presbyterianism, 271; rise of Free

Church, 273; rise of the secessions, 277; Cameronians, 279; moderatism, 281; revival of religious thought and life, 283; statistics of Scottish Presbyterianism, 285; comparative liberty among the denominations, 287; the annual assemblies, 289; the departed, 291; worship and religious thought, 293; representative men, 295; existing tendencies, 297; prospect, 299.

Cobden, 459.

Coffee-making in Arabia, 147.

Coke, Dr., 211.

Cunningham Lectureship, 347.

Dante Festival, 1; state of Italy in his day, 3; ancestry, birth and education, 5; youth, official life and banishment, 7; exile, wanderings and death, 9; burial-place, 11; discovery of his bones, 11; national canonisation, 13; his genius, 15; power of invective, 21; anti-Papal spirit and evangelic tendencies, 23; sincerity and intensity, 25; science, 27; English translators and critics, 29.

Deaconesses, 163; interest in the church, 165; need of them, 167; St. Paul, 168; precedents for the diaconate, 169; fourth council of Carthage, 169; Chrysostom, 170; primitive ordination of deaconesses, 171; indifference of the reformed churches, 173; Whitgift and Cartwright, 173; Dr. Flidner, 175; Devonport sisterhood, 177; Romanist leanings, 179; Miss Sellon, 180; Bible-women's association, 181;

- review of the systems, 183; objections, 185; general organisation needed, 187.
- D'Aubigné's Germany, England, and Scotland, 269.
- Davidson, Dr., translator of Fuerst, 268.
- 'Fatherhood of God,' Dr. Candlish, 336; Cunningham lectureship, 336; the first lecture, 341; objections to its argument, 345.
- Forster's 'Israel in the Wilderness,' 529.
- Free Church of Scotland, 270.
- Fuerst's 'Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon,' 268.
- Galatians, Lightfoot, 217; 'English Commentators,' 217; the Galatian people, 219; their conversion, 221; original soundness, 223; their perversion, 225; Judaizers, 227; St. Paul's defence, 229; 'the Epistle and the Acts,' 231; Antioch, 231; collision with Peter, 233; St. Paul and St. James, 235; St. Paul and the three, 237; idea of the epistle, 239; later Galatian church, 241; difficulties, 245; Gospel in the Galatians, 247.
- Gainsborough, 375.
- Gladstone on Dante, 29.
- Hamilton's 'Philosophy,' 410; the new school, 413; Mill contrary to Hamilton, 415; his estimate of Hamilton, 417; Hamilton's 'Natural Realism,' 419; contradictions as a realist, 421; relatively of knowledge, 423; 'Infinite' and 'Absolute,' 425; Calderwood, Young, and McCosh, 426; philosophy of the unconditioned, 429; Hamilton's 'Escape from the Philosophy of Nescience,' 431; 'Belief' and 'Knowledge,' 433; reason and belief, 435; Coleridge, 435; Jacobi, 435; Hamilton's 'Doctrine of Consciousness' reviewed by Mr. Mill, 435; the law of the conditioned, 437; sensation idealism of Mill, 439; space and extension, 441; verbal fallacies as to the infinite, 443; Mill's ultra scepticism, 445; Mill and Mansel, 447; Mill's 'Philosophy,' 455.
- Hardy's 'Jubilee of Wesleyan Missions in Ceylon,' 525.
- High Church Sisterhoods, 176.
- Hildebrand, 95.
- Inspiration, 256.
- Jenkins' Sermons, 256.
- Kaiserwerth, Institution of Deaconesses, 174.
- Lee's 'Reform in Church of Scotland,' 269.
- Leslie's 'Handbook for Young Painters,' 359.
- Lightfoot on Galatians, 230.
- Lincolnshire Fens, 61.
- Ludlow's 'Women's Work in the Church,' 183.
- 'Lyra Sabbatica,' noticed, 263.
- Man's Age in the World, 267.
- Mansel, 452.
- McCosh, Dr., 457.
- McKerrow's 'History of the Secession Church,' 269.
- Melbourne Ministry, 507.
- Merovingians, 45—51.
- Methodist Episcopal Church, 189; Dr. Stevens' 'History,' 189; Irish Methodist emigrants, 193; Captain Webb, 195; first itinerants, 197; Boardman and Pilmoor, 197; Francis Asbury, 199; Rankin, 203; physical phenomena, 205; the war, 208; Richard Bassett, 209; Dr. Coke, 211; 'Bishop,' 210; Jessie Lee, 215; Bishop Janes, 216.
- Mill's 'Examination of Hamilton,' 410.
- 'Ministry of Nature,' by Ingram, noticed, 266.
- Miss Marsh, 163.
- Oliver Goldsmith, 372.
- Palmerston, Lord, 458; Cobden and Palmerston, 459; hereditary statesmen, 461; the Temples, 461; Harrow, 465; Edinburgh and Cambridge, 467; first election, 469; first office, 471; first speech, 473; Portland administration, 475; war of 1810, 477; the three courts, 479; Catholic Emancipation, 487; Peel and Palmerston, 489; Test and Corporation Act, 491; foreign politics begun, 493; the first Reform Bill, 497; a Reformer, 499; the Eastern Question, 503; defeat at elections, 505; the Melbourne ministry, 507; Free-trade, 509; Affghan disaster, 511; return to Foreign Office, 512; Don Pacifico, 515; 'Civis Romanus,' 517; fall from office, 521; his second premiership, 523.
- Paris, 501.
- Peter the Great, 121.

- Phrygian Worship, 220.
 Poland, causes of ruin of, 119.
 Prophecy, Dr. Smith's work, 392; inspiration, 393; the supernatural, 395; Messianic interpretation of Scripture, 399; groups of prophecies, 401; the triple Antichrist, 405; prophecy an element of inspiration, 407; distinction of moral and scientific evidence, 409.
 Providential men, 56.
 'Quadruple Alliance' in 1834, 511.
 Queen Caroline, 480.
 Question, Danish, 472.
 Question, Eastern, 505.
 'Ragged Homes and How to Mend Them,' 163.
 Rankin, Thomas, 203.
 Realism, 418.
 Reform Bill, 417.
 Reynolds, Sir Joshua, 347; his biographers, 348; school-days, 351; Hudson, 353; in Rome, 357; London, 359; politics, 361; outset of career, 363; sitters, 365; allegorical portraits, 367; his energy and strength, 369; the Royal Academy, 371; Northcote, 373; methods of painting, 389; religious character, 391.
 Revelation of St. John, 301; Dr. Vaughan's 'Lectures,' 301; Præterist and Futurist, 303; theory influencing interpretation, 305; Mr. Elliott, 304; the seals, 307; 'Silence in Heaven,' 309; trumpets, 311; Eastern Empire, 313; witnesses, 315; visions and little book, 317; the trumpet angels, 321; sixth seal, 323; millennium, 329; binding of Satan, 331; Dr. Vaughan as a preacher, 333.
 'Robertson's Life,' by Charteris, 269.
 Roebuck's 'History of Whig Ministry,' 458.
 Romney Marsh, 59.
 Row's 'Nature and Extent of Inspiration,' 250.
 Royal Academy, 371.
 Russell, Lord John, his Letter to the Bishop of Durham, 517.
 Russian Church, 89; schism between east and west, 90; statistics of creeds, 93; religious formation, 97; Red Russians, 98; early encroachments of Rome, 99; Ivan the Terrible, 101; Church and State in Russia, 107; conversion of Poland to Popery, 109; Czar Demetrius, 111; expulsion of Poles from Russia, 113; accession of the Romanoffs, 115; United Greek Church, 117; causes of ruin of Poland, 111; theocracy of Peter 'the Great, 121; policy of Catherine, 123; Jesuits, 125; religious effects of dismemberment of Poland, 127; Paul, 129; Alexander, 131.
 Sabbath Storing, 267.
 Satan Bound, 330.
 Scottish Presbyterianism, 270.
 Secession Church, 276.
 Secessions in Scotch Church, 276.
 Sermons by Jenkins, noticed, 256.
 Siddons, Mrs., 385.
 Sir Hugh Myddelton, 67.
 Sir Joshua Reynolds, 347.
 Sir William Hamilton, 410.
 Sisterhoods in Church of England, 163.
 Slavonic Race, 93.
 Smith, Dr. George, on 'Prophecy,' 406.
 Statistics of Episcopal Methodist Church, 216.
 Statistics of Scottish Presbyterianism, 285.
 St. Paul and the Galatians, 240.
 St. James and St. Paul, 236.
 St. John and the Judaizers, 234.
 St. Peter and the Judaizers, 233.
 St. Paul's Infirmary, 224.
 Stephen Bathory, 102.
 Stevens, Dr., 'History of Methodist Episcopal Church,' 190.
 Temporal Sovereignty of the Pope, 22.
 Transmission of Property among the Germans, 55.
 'Trilogy of Dante,' translated by Thomas, 30.
 United Greeks, 118.
 Vatican and Kremlin, 130.
 Vaughan, Dr., on Revelation, 301; a preacher, 333.
 Vaughan, Dr., on 'Revelation,' 327.
 Vermuyden, 63.
 Wahabees, 159.
 Wakeley's 'Lost Chapters on the Early History of American Methodism,' 193.
 Wedgwood, Josiah, 85.
 Wesley and Watt, 191.
 'Wesleyan Mission in Ceylon,' by Hardy, 525.
 Whiteman's 'Haste to the Rescue,' 163.
 'Wilderness, Israel in the,' by Forster, noticed, 529.
 Wilkes, 491.



